

# THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. IV. No. 2

APRIL, 1911.

## THE STATE AND ENGLISH EDUCATION.\*

For the purposes of this paper, it is proposed to use the term "State" as meaning the authority of the Central Government, defined (so far as is necessary) by statute, and exercised (i) through Parliament, or (ii) through bodies of permanent officials, or (iii) through temporary Commissions, whether appointed for inquiry or for executive reorganisation, or (iv) in so far as the law directs, through local elected bodies. Thus, when used in special reference to English education, the term "State," so far as the action of the Government Departments is concerned, particularly (though by no means exclusively) involves the Board of Education. But it also connotes certain proceedings of the Treasury, the Local Government Board, the Home Office, the Board of Trade, and the Board of Agriculture, as well as, for certain purposes, of the Admiralty and of the War Office. Such a narrow and technical use of the term "State" would however be misleading, were it not borne in mind throughout that the influence of the State finds its way into education through the channels of custom, tradition and opinion, and that the operations not only of the Government Departments but of Parliament itself are limited by the generally prevailing sense of the community, with which any legislative or administrative advance must, if it is to be permanent, be in accord.

And, in the use of the word "education," the reader's assent is asked, upon grounds of convenience, to a limitation which, if not definitely stated and guarded against, would be still more misleading. Only those parts of education are referred to which are imparted in schools or in other institutions organised for training and instruction and which are recognised as falling within the scope of the Education Acts, or of the Endowed Schools Acts, or of statutes affecting Universities and technical schools. But it will be borne in mind that national education in the larger sense of the term includes many other agencies besides schools, colleges or universities.

### I.

The control exerted upon national education by the Central Government may take one or more of three forms. It may be (i) coercive; (ii) regulative or organising; or (iii) contributory. State control in English education when virtually confined to a legal embargo upon non-Anglican teachers was coercive. Secondly, at the stage when (the monopoly of the Church of England in licensing teachers having fallen into desuetude) State action in English education was limited under the Factory Act, 1833, to an

\* Part of this paper was read before the Sociological Society, November 29, 1910.

authorisation of the inspector to establish, or procure the establishment of, a school to enable the children employed in any factory to obtain the education required by that Act, without power being given to the inspector to compel a contribution from the poor-rate, it was in a rudimentary way regulative or organising. Thirdly, State action in English education became in an organised form contributory when, in 1833, the Government began to make an annual parliamentary grant for purposes of elementary education and, in administering that grant, relied upon the recommendations of the National Society and of the British and Foreign School Society, on the ground that it had itself no central organ for the inspection and superintendence of schools.

Modern methods of State control in education are an elaborate combination of the coercive element, the regulative, and the contributory. The emphasis which is laid upon one or other of these methods of control varies in different countries. Nowadays, in the coercive part of State control of education, the main factor is the enforcement of the law of compulsory attendance at school. Under modern conditions this form of the coercive factor has grown in importance while that which in earlier times was most usual, viz., the enforcement or attempted enforcement of restrictions upon the religious belief of the recognised teacher, has been weakened or abolished or restricted in the area of its incidence. But in all forms of State control there is retained the fundamental right to forbid, so far as statutory rights allow, any teaching which, in the judgment of the Executive, is contrary to public policy or subversive of the safety of the Commonwealth. State control of education means in essence the sovereign power of the State to prevent the school from being used in antagonism to itself.

In the regulative or organising part of State control of education, the crucial difference between various systems lies in the fact whether they have regard to the whole structure of national education from top to bottom, or only to a fraction of the whole: whether, in other words, their plan and purpose is synthetic or limited. This is more than a question of proportion; it involves a question of principle. The tendency of modern systems of State control, a tendency which first showed itself in the last half of the 18th century, is towards synthesis, though by no means to the exclusion of approved forms of corporate or private effort working alongside of the institutions established by the State or local authority. On the contributory side of State control of education, the main dis-

inction between different national systems lies in the degree to which they accord recognition, or independent initiative, or (within prescribed statutory limits) freedom of action to elected local authorities. A hardly less important distinction lies in the different attitude taken by different States towards the question of making subsidies towards private undertakings or in aid of the work of schools which represent the convictions and policy of some religious body.

In English education at the present time (1) the coercive authority of the State is enforced systematically in regard to the law of school attendance, subject to considerable variations of local by-law, but is hardly pressed at all in regard to individual freedom in the setting up of schools or to the giving of instruction in private and uninspected establishments: (2) the regulative or organising part of State action is creeping up by a kind of capillary attraction from the elementary grade (to which at one time it was virtually confined) to the more advanced grades of education, so that it has already embraced about half the secondary schools and is exerting an increasing influence upon the Universities: (3) the contributory part of State control is extensive in operation, but governed by no decisive principle. In fact English education is at present the scene of a conflict between the national and the cantonal principles, *i.e.*, between a system which relies mainly upon grants from the central government and one which relies mainly upon local rates imposed and collected by local elected authorities. The present English system of educational administration goes to a considerable length in making grants from public funds to schools which are in close connection with a religious denomination, but it does hardly anything in the way of giving subsidies to other forms of private educational enterprise, although it enjoys a practically unrestricted freedom to make grants from public funds in aid of private effort in secondary and higher education.

The chief weapons which the Central Authority can use (but only a few of which the English Central Authority at present uses) in the control of education are the following:—

(1) The granting of pecuniary aid upon conditions which secure to the Central Authority the right of continuous inspection and of prescribing *minima* of structural, hygienic, and didactic efficiency.

(2) The right to inquire into the application of educational endowments, to audit the accounts of their trustees, and to revise the objects of their expenditure.

- (3) The licensing of teachers.
- (4) The control of school books.
- (5) The control of studies in elementary and secondary schools by the issue of authoritative *Lehrpläne* and by the conduct of examinations (connected with inspection), especially of examinations held at the end of the school course and determining admission to certain departments of academic study and to certain forms of professional employment.
- (6) The control of the conditions of entrance to the Civil Service and to the liberal professions.
- (7) The enforcement of physical training or of military service, certain remissions from part of the latter being granted to male students who attain a prescribed level of secondary education.
- (8) The enforcement of continued attendance (in the case of boys or girls or both) at schools or classes, not only during childhood but through adolescence, employers of labour being placed under statutory obligation to permit the attendance of their younger workpeople at continuation classes up to a minimum prescribed by State law or by local by-law and at hours which do not entail physical or intellectual overstrain.

## II.

The growth of the Central Authority in English education has differed from that of the corresponding Central Authorities in Prussia or Japan through not having been originally planned upon any clear theory of national organisation or with systematic regard to the proportionate needs of the different grades of instruction. This historical fact has made the English Central Authority slower in its development, relatively more costly in its organisation, and less decisive in its influence upon national life. It has, however, caused it to be more tolerant of varieties of effort and more easily adjusted to differences in local and social feeling.

During the last ten years the influence of the Central Authority in English education has rapidly increased. There are signs of its further extension. Improved railway communications have made London more generally accessible, even from a long distance, as a centre for administration and for personal consultations. The Board of Education Act, 1899, by unifying the central authority, greatly enlarged its power for effective action. The new duties of the Board with regard to secondary, technical, and University education have brought into prominence certain aspects of educa-



tional policy which are national rather than local in their range and bearing. The enlarged inspectorate of the Board has enabled the central administration to watch public secondary schools more closely than before and to exert strong influence upon their courses of study and upon the plan of their organisation. The trend of things is towards an increase in the power and duties of the central educational authorities. English statesmen are now confronted, in the questions of educational finance and of the right age-limits for compulsory attendance at school or at continuation classes, by problems which cannot be dealt with satisfactorily upon a purely local basis. Some readjustment of the conditions of employment to the needs of further education is inevitable and will involve statutory interference upon a national scale. For the relief of local taxation certain branches of the educational service (*e.g.*, the education of the blind and deaf, of epileptics and the feeble-minded, and, possibly, the professional training of teachers) are not unlikely to be taken over by the Central Authority.

But there is no reason to regard with alarm this increase of its power and duties. An enlargement of the right kind of State influence in education would be a blessing, not a calamity, and need in no way involve any sacrifice of educational variety. All depends upon the temper of public opinion and upon the intelligent fairmindedness of the Central Authority. The main principles, however, of State action in educational affairs should, as far as possible, be defined by statute in order that the administrative action of the Central Authority may be checked, when necessary, by appeal to the High Court of Justice. Care will also be needed to prevent the filling up of forms or registers and the other incidentals of public control from encroaching too far upon the time of the teachers and especially upon the time of the headmaster or headmistress. Under a well-organised system of State inspection, every school might enjoy sufficient freedom of educational growth. The worst evils of routine are often due to the pressure of ill-informed public and parental opinion, against which the State could give much needed protection to the teacher. Within the broad lines of an intelligent and elastic form of State control there might always be abundant room for individuality of method, for educational experiment, and for originality. Four things—individuality of method, scientific experiment, originality of mind, and variety of type of schools—are indispensable to educational progress. No form of State control which curtails or discourages them will long continue to enjoy the confidence of a nation, or permanently retain its authority in educational affairs.

The great questions still outstanding in English education with regard to the authority of the State are as follows :

(1) Is it wise for the State to have an educational concordat with the great religious bodies ?

(2) Is it expedient that women should have a share not only (as is already the case) in local educational administration and (as is also already the case, though upon a more restricted scale) in the work of central administrative authority, but in the election of Members of Parliament and, as members of the Legislature, in the making of laws affecting education and social policy ?

(3) How far should the endowments of the great Public Schools, like Eton, Harrow, and Winchester, be directly controlled by Parliament or by the officers of the Board of Education ?

(4) Can sufficient variety of educational enterprise and of experiment be guaranteed under a State system of school administration ?

Within the limits of this paper it is not possible to discuss these four difficult questions in the detail which their complexity and political importance require. The writer must confine himself to the very brief expression of a personal opinion with regard to each of them. To the first question he would give, under present conditions of religious thought and political action in England, (with some qualifications) an affirmative answer, subject to the conditions that schools under public management and control should form throughout the country the groundwork of national education and that denominational and other alternative schools, established in response to parental preference, should be recognised as eligible for public aid on conditions exacting full efficiency and only in those areas in which more than one school can be maintained without impairing the interests of general education. To the whole of the second question he would also, under the present conditions of English life, give an affirmative answer, on the grounds that educational policy in its larger sense is intimately connected with the interests of family life, that women as well as men are intimately concerned in it, and that the national or parliamentary aspect of educational affairs is inseparable from the local or provincial. To the third question, while regarding as expedient some form of continuous supervision of the work and studies of the great Public Schools by the expert advisers of the Board of Education, he would reply in the negative, on the ground that the semi-autonomy enjoyed by these schools has proved of value in national education by promoting a variety of type and of

corporate tradition which has strengthened the hold of the older educational foundations upon the affections of their former pupils and (speaking generally) upon the respect of the nation at large. The semi-autonomy of these schools has preserved the freedom of the development of their corporate life and should rather be extended to the grade of elementary education than obliterated in the sphere in which it has survived. To the fourth question he would answer that, in education as in other departments of social effort in England, the State has done as yet much less than is desirable, and than might have been anticipated, to encourage scientific experiment in methods of teaching, in school hygiene and in organisation, but that there are signs (as for example in the appointment of the Development Commission) of an increasing public and departmental interest in this important aspect of educational work.

### III.

A few words should be said in conclusion upon a point which is of great significance from the point of view of sociological analysis. The theory of State control in national education, which sprang fully armed into the political debates of the French Revolution, and which has coloured some of the subsequent developments of Western political thought, assumes that, *vis-à-vis* to the State, the nation consists of individuals with equal rights (or with the potentiality of equal rights), and that therefore, in its educational policy, the State should suffer no intermediate groupings or self-governing organisations to stand between itself and the individual members (young or old) who form the national community. In other words, the educable individuals of the nation are regarded as units of presumably equal promise and of politically equal claims, which it is the duty and highest interest of the State to shake out into new combinations of social activity and service by means of a highly centralised educational machine. This theory had a threefold origin—philosophical, economic, and political. It rested, that is to say, (a) upon the philosophical doctrine of Helvétius and his school of thought that by means of early and prolonged education any stamp can be impressed, according to the predetermination of a sufficiently powerful government, upon the mind and character of each individual child; (b) upon an individualistic presupposition in economic thought—a presupposition which happened to be accompanied by another presupposition in favour of tight-strung organisation of the national

life, but which was essentially atomistic in its view of the component elements of human society; and (c) upon a belief in the necessity of obliterating the mediæval and eighteenth century class-divisions and religious corporations which were an obstacle to the thorough-going establishment of egalitarian democracy.

It will be generally agreed that this educational theory of the French Revolutionary thinkers—a theory which quickly influenced parts of the political thought of England and of America—had a certain sanitary value. Its operation purged the social system of France (and indirectly of England and of some regions of America) of parts of a social tradition which had become constricted, conventional, and obstructive. The practical applications of the theory scoured away a good deal that was obsolete, narrow-minded, and hurtfully repressive to humbly born talent or to abilities hampered by social and sex disqualification. But, seen now in clearer historical perspective, the limitations of the theory have become more obvious to students of the present generation than they could be to reformers of the Revolutionary and post-Revolutionary periods. And it must be admitted that the course of educational experience and the developments of educational and psychological thought have not been wholly favourable to the earlier theory. They have revealed certain seams of weakness in it and have suggested considerable limitations to its efficacy as a guide to educational administration. The Revolutionary thinkers exaggerated the formative and re-creative power of educational discipline upon the individual mind and character. They overlooked qualitative differences in human ability and power. They too confidently based their educational theory upon what telephone companies call a "flat rate." They were over-sanguine in their hope of securing human regeneration by means of a jet of educational influence, turned with precision and authority upon the still tender minds of the infants and children of the community. In the second place, most of the Revolutionary thinkers (and, still more, their later imitators) exaggerated the educational power of the elementary day school, in spite of its limited hours of attendance, its narrow curriculum, and its slender equipment. They under-rated the part which unconscious and subconscious influences play in the intellectual and moral development of every child. They failed to see that the play of these unconscious influences lies in a great degree beyond the reach of the educational administrator and even of the political authority of the State. And, hardly less important, they largely ignored the educational influence of

*group-life*. Their individualistic presuppositions blinded them to the fact that it is through group-action, group-tradition, and group-discipline that much of thought is coloured, energy directed, and character formed.

Hence it is not surprising that some of the most efficacious types of education during the period which has elapsed since the French Revolution have been those which, so far from being modelled upon Revolutionary principles, owed nothing more to the Revolutionary movement than the stimulus of challenge or of opposition. And it appears not improbable that the next application of Revolutionary principles to national education will be based in part upon a doctrine of the subconscious influence of the social group, a doctrine which the anti-Revolutionary parties preserved through their conservative loyalty to mediæval tradition. But the application of this doctrine of the educational influence of the well-assorted group to the upbuilding of the democratic collectivist State will involve measures of social reconstruction not yet thought out and an enforcement of centralised authority not yet palatable or politically possible.

University of Manchester,  
January, 1911.

M. E. SADLER.

## LAMAISM IN TIBET.\*

Lamaism, it is unnecessary for me to remind you, is a development or phase of Buddhism; and religion enters deeply into the lives of the Tibetans. It affects the whole course of their national policy. The Regent Lama who was the principal in the negotiations in 1904 commenced by asking the views of the British on re-incarnation. The unceasing refrain of those who came to meet me was that if we proceeded to Lhasa their religion would be spoilt. And the Dalai Lama himself sent me a message to say that if we insisted on going to Lhasa the Tibetan religion would be destroyed and he himself would die. I could not help, then, studying the religion of these people on its practical side; and though I do not pretend to have made the serious investigation of Lamaism which students like Mr. Rockhill, Colonel Waddell and Major O'Connor have made I trust that my observations on its practical working as a sociological factor in the development of the Tibetans may have some interest for this Society.

Perhaps, too, such observations as I made on the practical working of Lamaism in Tibet may have some increased value from the fact that I also chance to have had an opportunity of seeing its effect in Mongolia as well, for the Mongolians also are Lamaists. And before placing the result of my observations before you I would note the circumstance that both these peoples—the Tibetans and the Mongols—live in the most secluded countries in the world. The Tibetans live behind the highest mountains. The Mongols live in the deepest desert. Both, then, are by their natural surroundings disposed to be seclusive.

Possibly it is on account of this secluded character of their natural surroundings that they have laid hold of the idea of Peace. Peace is the central idea in practical Lamaism. Peace, almost at any price, is what the Tibetans aim at. To obtain it they are ready to sacrifice their national independence. Mohamedanism does not to anything like the same extent enjoin peace. Many Mohamedans in fact think themselves bound to

\* A paper read before the Sociological Society, February 7, 1911.



spread their faith even by means of the sword. It is a much more militant faith than Lamaism. I have had to travel alone among both Lamaists and Mohamedans. And I have had to conduct practical political dealings with both. The difference in the degree of stress which the two lay on Peace is most marked. And it is on this main ruling idea of Lamaism in practical life and on its effect upon the Tibetans that I wish to lay special emphasis in this paper. It is a sociological factor of high importance.

Wherever a traveller goes in Tibet or Mongolia, into whatever house he enters, he is sure to see a statue of Buddha seated cross-legged, with bent meditative head in placid, peaceful pose. It represents the ideal which the Lamaists—like other Buddhists—have set up. It is no energetic, masterful, purposeful ideal. It is no ideal of active humanitarian work. It is no ideal of vigorous proselytism. It is an ideal of contemplation, complacency and rest. And probably over no other people in the world has it established such a hold as over the Tibetans.

In the first communication we ever received from the Tibetans the Tashi Lama wrote to Warren Hastings: "Neither to molest, nor to persecute is my aim . . . . I am but a Fakir, and it is the custom of my sect, with the rosary in our hands, to pray for the welfare of mankind and for the peace and happiness of the inhabitants of this country."

The morning I left Lhasa the Regent Lama visited me and presenting me with an image of Buddha said: "When Tibetans look on this they think only of peace and I hope that you, when you look at it, will think kindly of Tibet."

And not in words only but in deeds the Tibetans showed their desire for peace. For a long time the Tibetans had orders not to fire on us and did not fire; just as we gave orders not to fire on them and did not fire. And when in the end, after nine months' negotiation, we came to an utter impasse and fighting did eventually occur, the Tibetans afterwards told me at Lhasa that their generals had no intention of fighting for they were with the troops; if they had meant their troops to fight they would of course have retired a day's march to the rear. Again, in their dealings with the Chinese the Tibetans have shown a similar desire for peace. When a Chinese general with 2000 troops was advancing on Lhasa a year ago Tibetan troops were sent to oppose him but with orders not to fight.

Over and over again when I met the Tibetan negotiators they repeated the formula that they were men of peace. There was an extraordinary difference between them and men of other portions of the Indian frontier with whom I had had to deal, and indeed between them and their next-door neighbours the Gurkhas. No one could be more determined to oppose us than the Tibetans. No one could be less prepared to fight. An Afghan looks and is always prepared to fight upon any pretext or upon no pretext. A Tibetan is the very incarnation of stolid passive resistance. I would not imply that the Afghan or Pathan never cares for peace or that the Tibetan never resorts to war. Having been attacked and besieged for two months by Tibetans I have had practical evidence to the contrary. What I do maintain is that the master bias of the one is more towards war than peace and the master bias of the other is more towards peace than war.

The Tibetans are, then, to a greater degree than any other people with whom I am acquainted imbued with this idea of peace. It permeates their lives and profoundly influences their actions. And this result is, I believe, to a large extent due to the influence of Lamaism. It is quite probable that the secluded character of their natural surroundings may have affected them in this direction to a certain degree, though I have known secluded mountain people who have been extremely warlike. It is quite possible again that the original natural character of the Tibetans was at least unwarlike. But after making such allowances I think there are still grounds for supposing that Tibetan love for peace is largely due to Lamaism.

Certainly this is so in the case of the Mongols. We all know that under Jenghiz Khan they almost conquered the world. They set up a dynasty in China. They over-ran Central Asia. Under the name of Moghuls they established an empire in India. They conquered Russia and penetrated to Central Europe. Yet at the present day they are as peaceful as the Tibetans.

The Tibetans were never as warlike as the Mongols. But in their early history they once carried their arms to the capital of China, at Sining-fu; and at another time a king of Tibet extended his sway through Nepal to the borders of India. And one sees in the course of their history that as Buddhism gained an increasing hold over the people and, as the Lamas acquired greater political influence, the idea of peace more fully permeated

the Tibetans and they gradually lost their warlike propensities. Let us examine this point.

It was by the same king who about 639 A.D. over-ran Nepal to the borders of India that Buddhism was introduced into Tibet partly through the influence of his wife, a Chinese princess, and partly through men from India itself. And such a hold did it take on the Tibetans that a king in the 8th century, being determined to raise all his subjects to the same level, enacted that there should be no distinction between poor and rich, humble and great. He compelled the wealthy to share their riches with the indigent and helpless, and to make them their equals in respect of all the comforts and conditions of life. He is said to have repeated this experiment three times; but each time he found that they all returned to their former condition, the rich becoming still richer and the poor still poorer. In spite, however of the unsatisfactory results of this experiment Buddhism gained an increasing influence in Tibet. Buddhists had at times to suffer much persecution. But the Buddhist scriptures were gradually translated into Tibetan. Large monasteries were formed. The celebrated Indian Buddhist, Atisha, was invited into Tibet in 1026, and became the first of the succession of chief priests who exercised paramount authority in the country. One of these was invited by Kublai Khan, the great Mongol Emperor of China, to his court and, in return for the teaching which he gave the Mongols, was invested with sovereign power over Tibet.

During succeeding centuries there was some struggle between priests and laymen and between the priests of different monasteries for the supreme authority. But in the 15th century the first of the Dalai Lamas was established at Lhasa and the supremacy of the Lamas has been little questioned since. They have gradually acquired complete temporal as well as spiritual authority, till at the present day the Dalai Lama at Lhasa is to the Lamaistic world very much what the Popes of Rome were to the Catholic world at the time when they possessed temporal power. And as the power of the Lamas increased the inclination of the Tibetans to war decreased. Even now it is noticeable that the semi-independent tribes of Tibetan origin who are not completely under the Lhasa Lamas are more warlike than the inhabitants of Tibet proper. And I think we have good grounds for concluding that Lamaism has increased rather than diminished any inherent disposition of the Tibetans towards peace.

The interesting point to consider now is what has been the practical effect on the national life of the Tibetans of this peaceful character with which, we are assuming, they have been imbued by Lamaism. I think I shall be able to show that while they have secured to themselves a considerable enjoyment of peace they have only been able to do this at the price of their independence.

During the minority of the fifth Dalai Lama the Mongols invaded Tibet and the Tibetans only secured their retirement by the payment of a heavy war indemnity. They applied for help to the first Manchu Emperor of China who had just ascended the throne and the Mongols became so incensed at this that they again invaded Tibet, subjugated the whole country, and made the fifth Dalai Lama supreme monarch of all Tibet in 1645. The Chinese Government in 1653 confirmed him in this authority. Mongols in 1706 and in 1717 again interfered in the succession of the Dalai Lama but the Chinese in 1726 finally established their paramount influence. The Tibetans, now completely under the sway of Lamaism, were becoming less and less able to resist outside aggression and more and more dependent on a protector.

This was the condition of things when we first came in contact with the Tibetans. But shortly after Warren Hastings had entered into relations with the Tibetans they were invaded by the Gurkhas. The Tashi Lama who had so impressed Bogle by his saintly, lovable character, and who was so respected and revered by his people, had died, or, as the Tibetans would prefer to put it, had withdrawn for a time from the world to re-appear re-incarnated in a little child. The Tibetans were immersed in their dreams of peace and living their life of religion, or at any rate of religious ceremonial, secluded from the rest of the world, when they were suddenly disturbed by a rough intrusion from the Gurkhas, their neighbours on the south. To this warlike race the riches of the Tibetan monasteries offered a strong temptation. The knowledge that the Tibetans had neither the power nor inclination to defend their riches made the temptation irresistible. The Gurkhas easily penetrated the country. They sacked Shigatse and carried off all the plunder of the monasteries. And the Lamas had to flee across the river Sanpo or Brahmaputra.

People for people, there was no reason why the Tibetans should thus have succumbed to the Gurkhas. The latter were not more numerous. The Tibetans live in a remote mountain-

ous country separated from the Gurkha country by high and difficult passes. If they had been as willing and ready to fight as the Gurkhas were they might easily have held their own and defended their country and possessions. But being so imbued with the idea of peace, they looked not to themselves to defend their own but to the Chinese. And the Chinese did indeed send an army and punish the Gurkhas, but as a price of their protection they enforced most rigid stipulations that the Tibetans were to leave their foreign relations entirely in their hands.

Theoretically this arrangement should have exactly suited the Tibetans. Under the protection of the Chinese and secluded by the mountains they should have been able to spend their whole lives in contemplation and religious worship, and without interruption to practise their master principle of peace. But human nature asserts itself among Lamaists as among the rest of mankind. We all want to have our cake as well as to eat it. The Tibetans eventually wanted not only peace but freedom also. Here came the rub. They could have the one or the other. The difficulty was to have both at the same time. They thought there was no harm in sending troops—not to fight, but simply to build a fort in the territory of a British feudatory, and they altogether refused to obey the Chinese advice to withdraw. They declined to be bound by the treaty which the Chinese made with us on their behalf. They sent missions to Russia, and as a result they became embroiled with us. And when they had become so embroiled they proved themselves as unfitted for the conduct of business political relations with a foreign Power as for the conduct of a campaign. And they got themselves into trouble not only with us but with their Chinese protectors as well, so that the Dalai Lama, after first flying from us to the Chinese, has now fled from the Chinese to us.

So many different factors are interwoven in these sociological problems that it is difficult to trace each effect to its true antecedent cause. Nevertheless I do seem to see some clear connection between that strong desire for peace which Lamaism has inculcated and the hopeless muddle and dependent position in which the Tibetans now find themselves. In saying this I feel I rather resemble the late Lord Salisbury who once complained of the feebleness of the Liberal opposition. But as a simple scientific conclusion I think I am justified in saying that the Tibetans' pursuit of peace has lost them their independence



and involved them in a political entanglement from which they are unlikely to extricate themselves.

I quite allow, however, that the criticism might be made that the Tibetans had not pursued their idea with sufficient thoroughness and completeness either in an active or in a passive way. They have adopted half measures. They have been alternately swayed by their desire for peace and by their love of independence. They have not actively and vigorously striven for peace; nor have they, with complete passivity, withdrawn altogether from worldly affairs. This much might certainly be said of them. King Edward was universally named the Peacemaker. But he did not retire into seclusion from the world. He went out among men. He was unrelenting in his efforts to secure peace. He took an infinity of pains to know men and to know circumstances and conditions. And he had this backing in his efforts, that he was the chief representative of one of the most pugnacious peoples in the world. If he had been the king, say, of Greece; if he had done the minimum of political work and, for the rest, lived the life of a recluse, he would not have had the influence he had in securing peace. In somewhat similar manner it might very reasonably be argued that if different Dalai Lamas had actively sought peace: if, instead of sometimes interfering in political matters and sometimes withdrawing into religious seclusion, they had taken as much pains as King Edward did to ensure peace, they might have attained it for their country.

Then again, it might also be argued that if the Tibetans had deliberately and whole-heartedly abandoned all idea of political freedom and not attempted to interfere in worldly affairs, but had put themselves entirely under the protection and control of the Chinese, they might have attained their goal of peace. Under such conditions they might with Tolstoyan sincerity have fulfilled the doctrine of non-resistance to evil. They might have remained secluded from the world in the enjoyment of absolute peace. They could have tilled their fields and retired to their monasteries untroubled by war. And once, after we had been fighting hard for most of the day in the valley below, I looked up, in the evening, to a little white monastery perched high among the mountains, far above the earthly strife and turmoil, and the thought insensibly rose to my mind how sublimely beautiful such a peaceful life of seclusion might be.

Whether the Tibetans might have attained their ideal by greater passivity or greater activity is thus only a matter of



conjecture. The one thing certain, however, is that half measures have only led to trouble. The pursuit of peace has led to sloth and ineffectiveness. And the experience of the Tibetans only seems to show the exceeding difficulty of combining peace with freedom. It is possible to have one or the other, but most difficult to have both.

Another principle Lamaism teaches is the wickedness of taking life. This again is a beautiful idea in principle but one difficult always to preserve in practice. We found the highest Lamas willing to eat a good meat dinner with us and thoroughly to enjoy the process. And the Japanese Abbot Kawaguchi who spent three years in Tibet, the most part of the time in Lhasa itself, states that more than 50,000 sheep, goats and yaks are killed during the last three months of each year. The Lamas seem to excuse themselves on the ground that the butchers are generally Mohamedans and by the consideration that as the animal is killed there is no harm in eating it.

Taking human life is different and against this the Tibetan certainly do have scruples. But these scruples have led them to terrible extremes in another direction. They will not hang or shoot a human being, but they will leave him to starve, and they will torture him in the most revolting manner—gouge out his eyes, cut off his hands, or keep him for years in dungeon without daylight. I can never forget the sight of a Tibetan whom we released at Lhasa, and who for twenty years had been left alone in a dark dungeon for no greater offence than showing hospitality to the Hindu traveller, Sarat Chandra Das. His skin was the color and texture of parchment. His eyes appeared to be glazed. His expression was a fixed gaze of horror as if under torture it had crystallised in perpetuity, and his mind was so numbed that the announcement of his release produced not the smallest effect upon him.

Such is an example of the evil to which the Tibetans have run in fulfilling their principles of not taking life. The good was evident in the tameness of all animal life in Tibet. Only in the very heart of London, where men—and boys too apparently—are too busy to think of molesting them, are birds so tame as in Tibet. The wild-duck, which, so long as they remained in India would not let a human being approach within gun-shot distance, as soon as they reached Tibet seem to know instinctively that they had reached a sanctuary and took hardly more notice of men than crows would. The snow trout responded to the allurements

of our fishing-rods with an innocence it seemed wicked to take advantage of.

This good may thus be accounted unto the Tibetans for righteousness, and two other results of Lamaistic teaching which to us coming from India were especially welcome I must also record. The one is the absence of caste. And the other is the freedom of women.

But I must occupy a short time first in referring to the deeply superstitious character of Lamaism. The Buddhism which entered Tibet, nearly a thousand years after the death of Buddha, was very different from the original pure teaching of its founder. It was perhaps as different as the Christianity of the time of William the Conqueror was from the original teaching of Christ. The primitive Buddhism taught salvation through self-culture. The Buddhism that reached Tibet taught much of Bodisats or Saints. In the common opinion, every great religious leader was one of these Saints who have inherited the "karma" of some great teacher of old. The Tibetan came to believe in innumerable saints. And the great Lamas were believed to be the outward appearances of saints in heaven. A Tibetan of the present day in consequence has the most superstitious reverence for these Lamas. They are supposed to possess altogether supernatural power. And the Tibetan belief in this power is no mere outward veneer: it enters deeply into the practical life of the people.

It often indeed brings them into impossible situations. When we were advancing to Lhasa the Dalai Lama, with less wisdom than our own King Canute showed, simply issued an order that we were to be told to go back to India. This was deemed to be quite sufficient and no Tibetan dreamed that it would not suffice. Consequently when we advanced, instead of going back, they were totally unable to cope with the situation. They imagined that lightning would come down from heaven or the earth would open and swallow up any one who dared to disobey the orders of one who was little less than a god; and when none of these things happened they were left without resource.

Similarly the levies which were ordered up fully believed that the charms which the Lamas gave them—little bits of brocade or cloth, or a peacock's feather placed in a box and hung round their necks, would make them immune to our bullets. In all innocence, therefore, they walked up to our rifles. When the inevitable result followed the faith of the survivors in their

charms was somewhat shaken. But the Lamas explained that the charms they had given were only effective against lead bullets while we had very cunningly used nickel-plated bullets with our new rifles. Fresh charms were issued, and the unsuspecting Tibetan renewed his faith.

The conclusion one naturally jumps to is that these Lamas must be rank impostors and frauds. But I am not sure that they are not themselves just as superstitious and credulous as the common people. As every one else believes they have these supernatural powers they believe it themselves. Take a Dalai Lama for instance. When only a baby he is selected, by an elaborate process, from amongst all the babies in Tibet, to be the re-incarnation of the Dalai Lama just defunct. Before he can speak he is worshipped as a god. Directly he can talk each word is treasured as a pearl of wisdom. What the effect of this must be not only on him but even on those about him is shown by Manning's account of his visit to the Dalai Lama of his time, then a child of only seven years of age.

Manning was the first Englishman to reach Lhasa. He paid a visit to the Potala in December, 1811, and after making due obeisance, touching the ground three times with his head, he gave his clean-shaved head for the little Grand Lama to lay his hands on. Manning says that the Lama's beautiful and interesting face and manner engrossed almost all his attention, and he concludes his account of the interview by saying that he was extremely affected by it and could have wept through strangeness of sensation.

It must surely follow that any man brought up from his babyhood like this Lama in such an atmosphere of reverence must of necessity himself think he is a god. Incarnate Lamas are born not made. They do not even inherit their supposed attributes from an earthly parent. Their saint-hood or god-hood is believed to come direct from heaven. Therefore from their earliest infancy, being surrounded by men who worship them as gods, and never meeting any man who thinks them otherwise, it is a matter of certainty that they must so think themselves.

The Lamas, then, as much as the people are immersed in superstition. In some few rare instances—as in the case of the Tashi Lama whom Bogle met in 1783—the touching faith, the realisation of high responsibilities, the remembrance of lofty ideals has produced a gentle and saint-like character. But, on the whole, these superstitions have tended rather to enchain the

minds of the people, to sap all the springs of progress and to bring stagnation into the national life.

I have said so much detrimental to Lamaism that I must now before concluding say something on those two good points which I have already mentioned, the absence of caste and the freedom of women.

In every country in which I have travelled I have observed some degree of caste in the form of class-distinctions. All countries have it to a certain extent. But that extreme form to which we are accustomed in India and which is such a terrible barrier to intercourse is quite unknown in Tibet. For a high-caste Pundit to sit down to dinner with one is an unheard of proceeding in India. The highest Lamas dined with us in Tibet. We know that high-caste Hindus after shaking hands with us will go and wash their hands to remove the pollution. Some of the higher Lamas did not show signs of having washed their hands before they greeted us.

The absence of caste makes the sociability of the Tibetans very noticeable to visitors from the Indian side. And it is worthy of special note that, secluded as the Tibetans are, they are also an extremely sociable people. Both the Bengali traveller Sarat Chandra Das and the Japanese abbot Kawaguchi have remarked on this. It is not wonderful that Sir Sven Hedin found them companionable, for he himself possesses a personality with which few could resist being sociable. What is remarkable is that the Tibetans, so renowned for seclusiveness, and so opposed to us as they were on political grounds, should yet have shown themselves to us as a sociable people. Once we had got into direct personal contact with them this soon became apparent. They are quite ready to sit and converse for hours. They are as a rule genial and polite. And the very humblest joke affords them infinite amusement. When I was told that the chief abbot of one of the greatest monasteries in Tibet was coming to visit me and when I was informed of his learning and of the respect in which he was held, I expected to meet an austere and rigid prelate. He did indeed correct me when I spoke of a globe as representing the earth and told me that the world was not round and spherical but flat and triangular. But except for this rebuke to my ignorance he was as genial and sociable and appreciated a good dinner and a glass of Chartreuse as well as any of the jolly friars of the good old days of yore.

Thus Lamaism has not, like Brahminism, tended to unsocial-

bility. Nor has it, like Mohamedanism, restricted the freedom of the women. Indeed, Tibetan women are the chief traders in the country. They are reported by Kawaguchi to have great influence over their husbands. And they go about unveiled as in any European country. The very clever and agreeable Tibetan wife of the Maharaja of Sikkim comes to dinner with Europeans, and all the time we were in Tibet hundreds of women used to come to the bazaars outside our camps, forming these bazaars themselves. The sight of Tibetan women going about with nearly the freedom of women in Europe in itself promotes a friendly feeling in the heart of a European visitor. He feels there is one great custom in common: that there is one less barrier to mutual intercourse.

Lamaism has many faults. It has encouraged sloth. It has sapped the virility of the people. It has deadened intellectual growth. It has fostered superstition. But it has not stifled the sociability of the Tibetans. There are few Asiatic peoples more sociable once political exclusiveness has been overcome. And now that they have reversed their former attitude to their neighbours and are as anxious for intercourse as they were formerly opposed to it there is hope that renewed contact with India will revivify their stagnant life.

FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND.

## CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT.\*

I HAVE been asked to read a paper on Co-operative Credit ; and I presume that your wish would be that I should endeavour to give such paper a practical turn, so as to assist you in forming a judgment, whether Co-operative Credit would be likely to prove helpful in this country and by what means it might be developed, rather than tell you once more of the brilliant effects, which to many appear altogether miraculous, that it has achieved elsewhere. As yet we have, unfortunately, in England practically nothing in the way of Co-operative Credit to show. Some attempts have been made to create it—unhappily in what to me appear entirely the wrong way, which is why I have had to decline to associate myself with them. But they have remained practically barren of results; whereas Ireland, more teachable, has done well with its credit, and India and Canada, beginning much later, have already scored distinct successes. So far as I can judge, the matter is still very little understood. There are evidently extremely hazy and incorrect impressions afloat as to the meaning of Co-operative Credit. Some people appear to imagine that here is an improvident borrowers' Eden, a new well-endowed association with lenient views and lax principles coming into the field, offering the easiest possible credit with little regard for security. Others speak of co-operative banks as "land banks," which in our sense they are not. Others, again, talk of them as "penny banks."

Then there is a notion abroad that Co-operative Credit means largess, and people are at great pains to discover treasures to be tapped for the supply of money, without giving so much as one thought to the provision of guarantees to make that money safe—although we know well that there is plenty of money in the country, in the words of the late Lord Salisbury, "money overflowing in the coffers of the bankers, so much money that you cannot get money for it," and that money seeks for employment as a mosquito seeks for a human victim. A distinctly misleading idea afloat is that there are distinctive "agricultural" banks and banks wholly "urban," although more than sixty years ago the elder Blanqui rightly declared: "*le crédit agricole, eh bien, c'est du crédit.*"

I beg you, if possible, to clear your minds once for all of these preconceptions, and believe me when I tell you that Co-operative

\* A paper read before the Sociological Society, March 7th, 1911.



Credit is a very simple thing and, once you understand what its ruling principles are, on all fours with all other business.

Co-operative Credit differs from other credit, as its name implies, in this, that it is co-operative. To those among you who purchase goods at the Army and Navy or similar "Co-operative" Stores that difference may not be apparent. But the Yorkshire or Lancashire artisan, who deals at his own genuinely "Co-operative" Store, knows well enough that here is his *own* shop, of which he is proprietor as well as customer, which serves only himself and his fellow members, and which exists for the special purpose of enabling him and as many as have joined with him in the enterprise, to purchase at the cheapest possible cost whatever goods they choose to buy collectively, without allowing any middleman to levy toll. It is the same thing in principle, only largely magnified, as if two or three people were to join together to buy among them a chest of tea or a truck of coal. Its object is service, not profit. It does not go into the market like other banking. It is restrictive, because it limits its services to those who join in taking the risk of the common purchase. But it is widely elastic, inasmuch as it is not bound by bankers' or moneylenders' accepted rules as to what constitutes acceptable custom and acceptable security, but opens a way to credit to all sorts and conditions of men, if they will only comply with its necessary conditions. That is its recommendation. It knows how to adapt itself to circumstances. And that is the object for which it was first called into existence. There were found to be classes of people—large classes they have turned out to be—who would have had a large and legitimate use for credit, to whom access to credit would have meant escape from bitter want, to the benefit of themselves and of the community, but who were denied it because, for want of some pledgeable tangible property, such as bankers would accept, they were unable to comply with the rules which, rightly and judiciously from their own point of view, bankers had laid down.

Now the first question which I have to submit to you is, whether we have any people of that sort among ourselves—people whom ordinary banks cannot supply and co-operative banks could. The two provinces, I admit, may be found to overlap at stray points. On many points I do not believe that a capitalist bank could replace a co-operative. It would also not be worth its while. But there are services in respect of which a co-operative bank has been found capable of replacing a capitalist. That accounts for the truly grandiose development of co-operative banking in the north of

Italy, where, when co-operative banks came into the field, capitalist banks were notoriously backward and insufficient in number; and also for the great power to which co-operative banks have attained in Germany—which country, in the days of Schulze-Delitzsch, was distinctly under-banked.

In this country banks are plentiful; their offices are widely distributed, and their services varied. We could not therefore here look for any of that accessory business which has helped co-operative banks in Germany and Italy. Nevertheless, I consider that it is plain as day that credit such as co-operative banks can supply is wanted among ourselves—it may be, urgently wanted. The requirement probably uppermost in your thoughts at this suggestion is that of the small holders whom we are exerting ourselves to create by letting or selling to them land from which, by itself, they could not produce a livelihood. Agriculture of every description in these days inexorably requires ample working capital to make it remunerative. Nobody, so I agree, stands in greater need of credit than these people. But there are, besides, a large host of artisans and people of a similar class to whom easy and cheap credit would be a boon. And there are others who would materially benefit if those who might give them employment were given free access to credit. Think of the £100,000,000 or so—the precise sum asked for by Mr. Chamberlain to revivify our trade—kept in steady circulation by less than 1,000 co-operative banks in Germany, fructifying in the shape of machinery, material and wages wherewith our neighbours carry on their active competition with ourselves! And, lastly—not to enter into particulars—there are those numbers of business men, great and small, of all callings, who find themselves deprived of credit upon which they had been taught to rely, and which was most convenient to them, by the absorption of private banks into immense joint-stock concerns, for which such credit is inconvenient, too little lucrative and, in view of their far removal from the customers to be served, scarcely any longer profitable. There are a great number of these people, and the withdrawal of credit means serious loss to them. I do not find fault with the banks for no longer giving it. Altered as they have become, it would be out of their line. But there is the gap left—and a gaping and staring one it is.

Well, suppose that all these various classes of people are—not to be helped; for no one can create co-operative credit for someone else, as some of our would-be patrons think—but to be enabled to help themselves. How are we to proceed?

There are several kinds of co-operative credit. But so far as they are sound and have stood the test of experience, in all of them the underlying principles are identical. Whoever would have credit must above all things provide security—good security, that can be relied upon. Please hold fast by this point! It is far too often neglected. Yet this is the pivot upon which the whole scheme turns. Here are people admittedly short of money and wanting to obtain some from others. They cannot expect to do so unless they can bring proof that the money will be safe and be repaid. The security taken by a capitalist banker is that which our people have not got, namely, some tangible, convertible value. But we *can* make sure that our money will be dealt out only for employment which seems safe and remunerative, and to people that appear trustworthy. And that is what we have to do. Publicity—that “maximum of publicity” which Sir R. Morier insisted upon—will make it known to the world that we have adopted such safeguards. To make their presence known, in their earliest weakness, the little bank of Milan, beginning with only £28, and now doing a business of £80,000,000 per annum, and the admirably managed People’s Bank of Mentone at first posted their daily balance-sheets outside their office doors every evening. And the world soon came to understand that they were safe.

For a margin beyond good management based upon these principles, such as people invited to become creditors are entitled to ask for, there will in course of time be a reserve fund—which is a most important feature in co-operative bank organisation, a reserve fund carefully nursed into bigness; and both at the outset and throughout there will be either a “capital of guarantee,” as it has been called—a share capital, that is, which will stand the racket of any loss occurring, and on which creditors must have the first claim; or else the absolutely unlimited liability of members, up to the hilt, one for all and all for one; or, lastly, a combination of both, which I do not approve of, but which is, for obvious reasons, much liked in Germany and Austria, and is already growing popular in some parts of India.

But let us first deal with the security of employment. It is a fundamental principle with all co-operative banks worth their salt, a precept written large in all rules, that not on any account or upon any consideration is any risk to be incurred. That ought to be taken as self-evident. Because only by the careful avoidance of all risk, and consequently loss, can a bank hope to provide the cheapest possible credit—which is its object—just as a store ensures

cheapness by insisting on cash payment for all purchases, which once more excludes risk. Therefore those British "co-operative banks" which allow their money—in this case all of it borrowed money—to be invested "in shares of any society registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act"—sin, as the prophet Isaiah has put it, "with a cart rope." Every such society is more or less speculative; some are very much so. It is inconceivable to me, how the Registrar of Friendly Societies could have approved such a rule. A co-operative bank wants to be iron-cased against all risk.

Now the first safeguard against loss is of course the creation of a thoroughly trustworthy clientèle by the election of members and restriction of all the ordinary kind of business to members alone. In banks based upon a share capital you cannot altogether prohibit business with non-members, because you may at times have surplus money for which there is no call from members, but which, left idle, would mean loss. However, those will be special cases, in which you may sufficiently safeguard yourselves. "The best guarantee of a co-operative bank," says M. Luzzatti, "is the character of its members."

And you will have to make it understood that membership is a *privilege* to be conceded or withheld, not a commodity to be bought by anyone. Therefore, once more, those British "co-operative banks" are hopelessly wrong which lay it down in their regulations that upon a bank being formed in a village you are to ply the district with handbills, beat the big drum and tout for members. You might as well tout for "Gardsteins" and "Peter the Painters" to seek the privileges of British citizenship. Applicants must be left to come to you.

And you will have to shape your working district so that you can, without effort, keep all your members under easy observation and in touch with you and with one another, so as to be able to exercise inoffensive restraint, and also to keep your committee representative of all component parts of the bank. For the essence of co-operative banking is control at all points. Where lending is at all brisk you will do well to put a credit valuation upon each member, so that your executive officer may be able within ascertained limits to give him credit without further ado. Beyond these limits—such cases are bound to occur—the borrower will have to provide further security beyond his character. The valuation list ought to be kept strictly secret in the hands of the valuing committee and the executive officer.

Furthermore, you will do well to make a point of taking security for every advance made, even when the amount is within the valuation, as a means of facilitating recovery, avoiding disputes, cultivating mutual control and accustoming members to the practice of giving security, which at first is inconveniently novel to them, but soon becomes familiar. If you do not take security on principle from all, you will find it rather difficult to enforce it where you really cannot do without it; for it will be held to imply a stigma.

Your security ought, wherever practicable, to be personal. For credit purposes that is out and out the most convenient, and it is also at the same time the most educating form of security. It requires no surrender of possibly useful property on the part of the borrower; it commits the lender to no seizure of an inconvenient pledge, which might become a white elephant; it establishes a system of automatic control which is as the life blood to co-operative credit, placing interested watchers at all points between borrower and lender. And people soon, to use a colloquial phrase, "tumble to it." Advancing one step further you provide for safety by making sure that the loan which you give will be well employed—legitimately, as regards the person employing it, and fructifyingly, so as to repay itself out of its own return.

All these safeguards will have to be applied with varying degrees of strictness, according as for ultimate security you rely upon a sufficient money payment from members in the shape of shares, or else upon their unlimited liability all for one. The more uncovered liability there is the stricter will you naturally have to be, alike in electing your members, in inquiring into the object of loans, and in control of their employment. Indeed, I do not think that a statement which I have made puts the case at all too strongly, namely, that to make borrowing under the circumstances with which you have to deal possible, you must make it difficult. The last thing that we want to do is to encourage improvident borrowing. Improvidence of any sort is what we must do our utmost to discourage; for we cannot hope to flourish for any length of time if we do not educate our people in sound economic principles.

I will deal with the difference between the two distinctive kinds of co-operative banking—that based on a share capital, and that based on unlimited liability—at once. Both are useful, and both are necessary—the one under one set of conditions, the other under another. And the consideration comes in usefully here, at the point where we are dealing with security.



When co-operative banking was first introduced, limited liability was unknown. Therefore there was no choice but to accept unlimited. And the advantages which it offers as a more generous procurer of credit make it still valued in Germany and Austria, where a curious provision of the law respecting limited liability favours such preference. For the Austrian and German law as a rule makes the "limited liability" shareholder liable much beyond the value of his share, which rightly is our recognised limit. This is not like our taking a big share and paying up only a small call upon it. The share is supposed to be paid up in full. But for the creditors' security the shareholder is made liable beyond that, in order to make him careful. It is like a mortgage, with personal liability at its back. And, since in matters of credit the temptation to the impecunious always is to pay little down and rely much on liability—which it is hoped will never have to be drawn upon—there has been considerable mischief done by fixing the share low and the liability at 50 or even 100 times its amount, so that under this aspect limited liability has really become the more gambling form. There is much more to be said on the question; but it scarcely concerns us, since our preference for limited liability, wherever practicable, is so pronounced and so deeply rooted, that a whole battalion of German professors would argue in vain against it.

But it is not practicable under all circumstances. It presupposes, of course, a share capital adequate or promising to become so. And the whole cast of a share bank presupposes fairly active business. In country districts money is scarce and business moves slowly. When you come down to a very low stratum a share might be a barrier. Even an entrance fee may be so. And it is just at this point that your help is required most urgently, and that, happily, unlimited liability is easiest of application and may be kept free of risk. It is indeed only practicable among communities of locally and numerically limited extent, in which sufficient automatic knowledge of members among themselves, sufficient automatic supervision of one another, and, generally, sufficient touch and realisation of community of interest prevails to make people—elected in this case with particular care by themselves—disposed to rely upon one another. And it is only safe where credit business is not very lively, but consists of loans asked—generally for some little time—for purposes which may be watched and are not likely to be asked for at very short notice. Under such circumstances you are perfectly safe in mortgaging—for that is what it comes to—members' liability as occasion may demand. Under such circum-



stances also unlimited liability naturally brings out not only that acute vigilance applied to borrowers which under the conditions is indispensable (but which limited liability would not awaken), but in addition a remarkable feeling of brotherhood and disposition to co-operation for other purposes—for which the co-operative bank can easily provide the funds—and also that peculiar altruistic and philanthropic sentiment, which is a marked characteristic of this kind of co-operative credit, and which endears it so much to philanthropists and social reformers. That sentiment is accentuated by the fact that here the wealthy man may effectively benefit his neighbours, without demoralising them by gifts. He must *not give*, but he may become one of them; and then for a long time the burden of unlimited liability will rest, financially, mainly upon his shoulders. That appears to have frightened a good many away. But it need not frighten anyone, for the sum coming into play is not likely to be large; a binding limit will certainly have to be drawn; and if the wealthy member only does as he should, and gives his active work as well as his liability—if he cannot, he had much better not become a member but pay in a deposit or give a guarantee—in addition to conferring the often inestimable boon of experienced guidance upon his beneficiaries, he will have the power of restraining their use of his liability, by placing himself in a position to threaten retirement as soon as any imprudent commitment is decided upon, which will end his liability for the future at once.

Yes, but please do not let us play with “unlimited liability,” as is done by some of our leading champions of the movement, whose main object it appears to be to deprive the liability of wealthier members of all its value, together with its supposed terrors, while retaining for those people all the spurious glory of having fathered and financially befriended co-operative credit. I have seen rules in which such patron members are made “honorary members” only, with all the say, all the kudos, but no liability. At the present time there are rules in circulation which allow them to go out at any time and be quit of all liability within six months. Once more I am surprised at the Registrar sanctioning such a rule; for it means doing the creditor—the lender to the bank or the depositor—out of the very security upon which his credit was asked for and obtained, without even letting him know and enabling him to withdraw his loan or deposit. That may expose you to charges of fraud. On the face of it the liability so pledged is worth nothing. I am quite prepared to allow retirement at any moment—although the Germans, who are our chief masters in the matter, have recently

limited power to retire only to the end of a financial year, after six months' notice. That would not suit our present stage of development. However, liability for past engagements must in honesty continue till the creditors who have lent upon it can secure themselves. Abroad the time limit is usually two years, but in some cases five. If our "patrons" would have the glory of helping, let them help in truth and in fact! Their liability is necessary, if only to ensure their work.

So, please understand, the unlimited liability banks are intended only for small people with small available means, living together in compact little communities and therefore capable of watching one another. I call them village banks; and that is the correct name for them. A parish is the best district for them. They are admirable when organised on the proper principle, which I am afraid that some of our rural banks are not, though they choose to call themselves "Raiffeisen." But these modest little societies cannot possibly supply the larger wants of substantial farmers, nor those of industrial districts, no matter whether they be "urban" or "rural." For such purposes you must have banks with a share capital proportioned to the needs of the case, and with limited liability, about which I shall have something to say in a minute.

But first, to complete my enumeration of safeguards to be adopted to ensure security, allow me to call attention to the indispensableness of a well-contrived mechanism of control or supervision. Every single act that is performed ought to be checked by some independent authority. The Council of Supervision, as I used to call it—I now believe that the Council of Inspection may be better understood—which all rules except those in use in this country provide for as indispensable, is no merely ornamental appendage. To say, as our English rules do, that there *may* be a Council, is to give the whole case for co-operative credit away. There *must* be a body, distinct from the Managing Committee, not only to audit accounts, but also to overhaul regularly all that has been done by the Committee, and bring the Committee to book, while also preparing a review of what has happened during the year that the General Meeting, which is the chief controlling body, but which is not likely to be skilled at dissecting balance sheets without help, can understand. In banks of any pretensions that Council will do well to seek the assistance of a trained actuary. And it will be well if, on the top of it, well endowed as it is with local knowledge, there is a superior inspection still by some competent officer of a Union of Banks, who probably will possess larger general and

technical knowledge, as well as greater detachment. As I have urged in the case of liability, do not let us play with this question of Control. Wherever losses and collapses have occurred—and of course there have been such—the fault has invariably been found to lie with the Council for neglecting to do its duty, on a courteous assumption that the Committee would not do anything wrong.

That disposes in outline of the question of safeguards. I now turn to the no less important subject of the supply of funds.

It may be questioned whether shares deserve a place under this head. For in unlimited liability banks there need be none, or else shares are likely to be of only nominal value; and in limited liability banks share capital is intended rather as a "capital of guarantee" than as working funds. But it is of prime importance that co-operative banks should pay particular attention to the steady and progressive accumulation of some capital of their own. That will mean greater security for creditors, greater security for members, a power of borrowing augmented in considerably larger proportions than by what is added to the bank's capital, and also permanency of the institution, such as in itself makes for greater strength.

Unlimited liability banks with no shares have no means of creating such capital except by adding as largely as they possibly can every year to the reserve fund, which in these banks is really an endowment fund, belonging to the bank as a whole, and never divisible, not even on dissolution, lest there be an inducement to dissolve for the sake of the spoils. Obviously, where there are no shares there can be no dividend; and, beyond this, dividend is here advisably kept out, in order that there may be no clashing of interests, as between suppliers and borrowers of money. By steadily taking advantage of opportunities such fund may be raised to fair, and often even to substantial proportions.

Limited liability banks will do quite as well to study the accumulation of reserve, which of course strengthens the position of a bank and lessens liability to shareholders. There are in fact, a good number of these banks possessing a reserve larger than their share capital. But in this case the reserve fund distinctly is a reserve, not an endowment. The endowment has to be looked for in shares. Now as regards shares, for our British circumstances I distinctly prefer M. Luzzatti's plan of not very substantial shares, to the precise amount of which the owner's liability is limited, and which have to be paid up in short time—a year or two, after which fresh shares may be taken—to Schulze's of making the shares large

—up to £50, or even more—and allowing time (in a Swiss bank it is a lifetime) for payment. It is much better to have what capital you possess in ringing cash in your safe, than to have liability or unpaid cash hanging over. They are in such a case a doubtful quantity. They may not be paid. You cannot therefore implicitly rely upon them. A gentleman once suggested to me as an improved plan to issue £2 shares, on which only £1 was to be paid up, so as to “give the bank a hold upon the members.” The boot would be on the other foot. That would give the member “a hold” upon the bank, which must either allow the liability for the £1 unpaid to remain unused or else may have to tremble for the money’s coming in. It is not our interest to accustom members to pay up little and rely upon liability. Quite the reverse. As Lord Beaconsfield laid it down to be the first duty of a minority to convert itself into a majority, so we are bound to regard it as the first duty of a non-capitalist to convert himself into a capitalist, and to provide according to our powers facilities for his doing so. That is why Schulze’s banks were at first styled “compulsory savings banks.” M. Luzzatti calls his “perfected savings banks.” Where you have shares you can fix the value of those shares at your will according to the conditions of the case. I know one very good little bank with only 4s. shares. It is for working men and women, and renders useful service. Whatever the value of the share, under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act you can accumulate shares up to the total value of £200. And you will do well to bear in mind that with small means you can attain only small results. Therefore unnecessary chariness is a mistake by which you yourselves will suffer. On this point you will have to shape your action according to your case.

For your real working capital you will have to look to borrowed money, whatever be the shape in which it is borrowed. That it is which distinguishes a bank from a mere Loan Society or Slate Club, which does not borrow and whose benefits are limited. And the best way in which you can borrow money, so I will tell you at once, is that of taking deposits. That will give you the cheapest and the most dependable money, which also secures to you greatest independence. Mr. Gladstone admitted that his object in securing all savings money for the State, was, “to give the Minister of Finance a strong financial arm and to make him independent of the City.” I admit the difficulties of attracting deposits in the earliest stage. But they are to be got over. Our

collecting banks experience no difficulty in obtaining savings. Meanwhile you benefit others by training them to thrift. Other methods are allowable and even necessary at the outset, and always to be kept in view as a helpful reserve. But you will do well to remember that all money obtained by other means is likely to stand you in higher interest, and to make you more dependent upon those who supply it. You can have overdrafts from banks, fixed deposits for long periods at a proportionately higher rate of interest, advances from the State or from other authorities. I hope you will steer clear of the last-named supply if you can. You may see now in Ireland what embarrassment it leads to—no good done and arbitrary withdrawal in a most damaging way. Something similar has been prudently forestalled in Germany. The great Agricultural Union of Co-operative Societies, with 19,000 Societies, of which number about 15,000 are banks, was bred up in absolute dependence upon State help. It found that State help meant very troublesome State interference. I take just the least little credit for its changing its policy and making efforts to arrive at independence by means of deposits, because I contributed one of those four prize essays which are now, I am told, distributed by the hundred thousand, preaching the cause of thrift. In August 1898, the chairman of the Union told me, somewhat boastfully, that they had a million and a half accumulated in deposits. That was before the change. In conjunction with a smaller Union now absorbed, they now hold six millions. Also I hope that you will beware of Central Banks employed as financing institutions before there are an at all considerable number of local banks to support them. Central Banks will be useful enough at a later stage, and at that stage they may do some financing. In your earliest stage your proper endowers are friends who wish to serve the cause. Soon you ought to be able to command credit for yourselves. Also beware of inter-linking the liabilities of different banks. Leave each one to stand securely on its own bottom. In the early stages overdrafts with commercial banks, guaranteed by friends, will be a help. We have such in Ireland where the "agricultural banks," in spite of faulty rules, having caught the co-operative spirit, are setting us a bright example; and we have them in India, which with its several thousands of banks—the movement having practically begun only in 1905—casts our puny would-be pioneering entirely into the shade. In both countries those who set up for teachers took care to learn before they taught. And in both countries private people, having learnt, show themselves ready to help with money.



So far as your banks have commercial and industrial centres for their working districts, once they have vindicated their trustworthiness, you will also be able to raise fresh funds by passing on the promissory notes or bills of exchange taken to strong financial institutions, probably at a profit. But you cannot expect to do that in a hurry.

I do not think that it remains for me to tell you anything more except to lay down some general suggestions as to the policy of organisation and work.

Above all things, please remember—what timid bankers often forget—that yours is an institution different altogether from a capitalist bank. It is *not* a capitalist institution and is as little likely to hurt capitalist banks as a school is to hurt a church. You combine to secure a service, not to obtain a profit. In one case, at any rate, you must employ share capital. The reward for such should in every case be limited, or you may get at once on the broad road leading to perdition by creating a duality of interests and letting in the devil of greed. As between the provider and the borrower of money it is always the latter, for whose benefit the bank is intended, who goes to the wall. I could tell you of abuses that have resulted. Your annual surplus—such as there should be—belongs, after deduction of a good slice for reserve, and payment of a limited interest on shares, to your *customers*, future or past, to be employed either in a lowering of interest on advances in the future or to a dividend on custom, according to the measure of such custom, for the past.

Please do not overburden your governing bodies with an overlaboured agenda. I have seen rules in which the committees of little village banks are told to go through so many forms in stereotyped order that they must be tired out before they come to real business. Committees are required to have the fear of their Councils perpetually before their eyes, but they must also be able to act promptly. In the French Alps you may see the three committeemen of a village bank settling an urgent loan, as they meet on their walk through the village. In a big Schulze-Delitzsch bank, where there are likewise three men to attend to the business, you may see them agreeing as readily on a transaction proposed.

In dealing with your money it is a good practice, if ever that money should run short, to give the preference to the smaller loans asked. That will probably mean favouring the small people. And it will put your eggs into a greater number of baskets.

Services of committeemen and the like are often given gratuitously. In banks based upon unlimited liability they must be



so. For otherwise the committeeman, who is the judge on credit, may cease to be a free agent. His remuneration may be worth something to him, and for that he is dependent upon the votes of those who apply for credit. Remember that you have here to deal with a little village society. In banks based upon shares, you may pay your Committeemen and Councilmen, but I think you had better not. However, as soon as your bank grows at all active, I advise you to call in the help of a skilled accountant or banker.

There is much that I have necessarily had to leave unsaid. But I believe that I shall have at any rate made it clear to you that here is no mere chimera, no socialist dream, nor yet a semi-eleemosynary institution begging for largess, and have proved that here is an institution which might be made to fall in very well with our national habits and methods and might be rendered exceedingly useful among ourselves. So far from its being over "collectivist," our Co-operators, who believe themselves to be red-hot Socialists, for the moment still consider Co-operative banking too individualist to merit their support. Could they discern how much it might be made to help them in their collection of deposits and in their otherwise very useful wholesale banking—which for many services still has to rely upon commercial banks—they would not be quite so ready with this judgment. Abroad both Co-operative production and Co-operative distribution derive very material benefits from it; and Co-operative Agriculture confesses itself bankrupt without it.

What we still want, I am afraid, is a better distribution of knowledge. Enamoured of the general idea people run away with the notion that here is a thing so self-evident that it does not require to be learnt. And they hasten to show that they have not learnt it by beginning at the wrong end, the provision of money. However, the cornerstone of the whole system, the indispensable foundation, is security.

What is good in itself is bound to force its way to the front. And as even we under the Union Jack have reaped success, in Ireland, in India and in Canada, we have reason to hope that, though we have hesitated long, in the end we shall see Co-operative Credit triumph also at home.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

## THE SOCIOLOGY OF "RACE."\*

THE translation of H. S. Chamberlain's *Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* by Dr. John Lees, with an introduction by Lord Redesdale, is a gallant attempt to set up by intellectual *réclame* an English vogue for a work which has had a somewhat surprising success in Germany. There, doubtless, the applause of the Kaiser had much to do with the publicity of the treatise; but for those who have been taught to think of the German reading world in the lump as a highly critical audience the acclamation given to the book is a reminder that the "Teutonic," like other "minds," has room for all grades of thought. Lord Redesdale informs us that on its appearance it "at once arrested the attention of the literary world, and was speedily declared to be one of the masterpieces of the century;" and the translator, for his part, protests that "knowledge alone, however complete, of the German and English languages is wholly insufficient for the task of reproducing in English the erudition, philosophy, scholarship and incomparable style of the original." The last proposition is obscure. Style is indeed hard to render; but "erudition" and "scholarship" would seem susceptible of conveyance with due pains; and when Dr. Lees, in a footnote (i. 253) refers us to "the *Führer des Irrenden* of the Jew Maimuni," an English reader may reasonably demur to the retention of the German translation of the title of the Hebrew *Guide to Doubters* of a writer commonly cited in English as Maimonides. That, however, is a small matter; and it is but fair to Dr. Lees to say that he has done his work very well, reproducing at once the voluble swing and the ruthless prolixity of the original. What a critic is driven to object to is the uncritical panegyric passed by the translator and the introducer on Herr Chamberlain's treatise.

It should be at once recognised that the author is really a man of talent and of wide reading. His facility in writing an adopted language tells of uncommon capacity in that direction; his studies have been really extensive; and his variety of reflection and command of diffuse eloquence are not to be questioned. They will

\* "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century." By Houston Stewart Chamberlain. A translation from the German by John Lees, M.A., D.Lit. (Edin.). With an Introduction by Lord Redesdale, G.C.V.O., K.C.B., etc. London: John Lane. 2 vols. 25s. net.

doubtless secure him a wide public in this country, where, as elsewhere, "nothing succeeds like success." But on serious students of sociology the work, which in effect claims to be nothing if not sociological, will probably make an impression best comparable to that of a jubilee procession, made up of a protracted series of military bands and parading uniforms, marching to as many tunes. The total effect is one of simple self-proclamation and vociferation. Lord Redesdale, had he been less of a worshipper, "appalled at the range of reading" of his master, might usefully have subjected the amorphous mass to some process of logical analysis. But he has seen fit only to reproduce in rhetorical outline parts of the rhetorical pageant of the original, with the avowal: "I console myself with the thought that even had I been far better fitted for it, I could not within the limits of these few [52!] pages have given a satisfying account of a book which embraces so many and so various subjects." Lord Redesdale has in fact his master's fatal facility of eloquence, and writes his introduction not because he sees a need of analysing the treatise down to its scientific purport, but precisely because he enjoys its declamatory method and its vivacious empiricism.

Broadly speaking, Herr Chamberlain undertakes to set forth in a series of appreciations the inherited and other elements which have made modern civilisation what it is. Those elements are for him reducible to specific contributions by "races." That is to say, he conforms to the besetting sin of German historiography, the explanation of national and social phenomena in terms of themselves. Though he sees and notes that all so-called races are alike mixtures, he is content not merely to divide them into good mixtures and bad, but to dub them alternately good and bad according as they collectively prosper or otherwise. Thus in his pages we are still, sociologically speaking, at the stage of the "horology of the clock" and the "dormitive virtue of opium." As Seeley thought it useful to write that Rome decayed because of the "failure of the crop of men"—that is, because there was decay—so Herr Chamberlain accounts for the rise and excellence of Hellenic civilisation by the goodness of the Hellenic stock, and for the decline of the same civilisation by the perversity with which the good stock went wrong. "The dog, to gain his private ends, went mad, and bit the man."

It is surprising that a writer who, like Herr Chamberlain, has paid considerable heed to biological matters should never reach in this connection either the biological or the sociological point of

view. His biology is a mere rod wherewith to beat the undesirable dog and herald the favourite. "Crossing," he repeats again and again, "destroys characters"—a Darwinian statement which really amounts only to saying that crossing means further change. "Characters," as Herr Chamberlain incidentally acknowledges, are just a given result of crossing. But he tells how the crossing of a pack of greyhounds once with a bulldog helped the breed, whereas further crossing produced only mongrels; and he evidently assumes that to say "mongrel" is to say "degenerate," though he had told how the "noble" Newfoundland is a cross—*i.e.*, a mongrel—between an Eskimo dog and a French hound. "Mongrel," as a pejorative term, means only deviation from a *preferred* mixture: the new mongrel may be a far more viable and a far more lovable type than the greyhound, the older mongrel. But Herr Chamberlain alternately disparages Syrians *qua* mestizos, and glorifies the Hellene mestizo as (in some respects) the happy product of the right amount of mixing.

His accounts of individuals are thus sheer mystifications. Is Lucian fitful and frivolous, passing butterfly-like from literary flower to flower? Then it is because he was a Syrian, a mixture. Is the very serious Augustine vacillating and self-contradictory in his philosophy? Then it is because he, too, was a mestizo. As the most concentrated and self-consistent men are also mixtures, in the terms of the case, we are left with absolutely no semblance of explanation save that there are good mixtures and bad mixtures; and as sound and unsound types are found side by side in every group at any given stage, the conception of a good mixture in turn goes by the board. Nothing remains but the blank truism that individual organisms do what they tend to do. All the same, however, Herr Chamberlain, avowedly writing as a "conscious Teuton," decides that everything of which he approves in mediæval and modern civilisation, nay, "our whole culture and civilisation of to-day, is the work of one definite race of men, the Teutonic" (i. p. lxxvii) *i.e.*, the North-European, in which he includes the Celts and the "genuine Slavs." Everything undesirable, on the other hand is "anti-Germanic," the work of the "non-Teutonic" peoples, typified by Loyola and Napoleon. As if there were not legions of lesser Loyolas and Napoleons among the Teutonic stocks, and swarms of their intellectual and moral contraries among the non-Teutonic. As if, by Herr Chamberlain's own admission, modern civilisation were not indebted to Saracen science, Semitic astronomy, and Indian arithmetic.

Even a believer in the empty dogma of "race," one would think, might sometimes catch sight of the real problem: What are the *conditions* of a progressive race? But Herr Chamberlain simply walks over the issue when he meets it. "He who shares Janssen's opinion that it was printing which 'gave wings to the intellect,'" he writes (ii. 337), "might explain to us why the Chinese have not yet grown wings." His "explanation" is that it is simply because they are Chinese. The Teutons utilised paper and printing because they were Teutons! A Japanese schoolboy, one fancies, might put the question why the Teutons waited so long to be truly Teutonic, and might suggest the theorem that previous environment, previous lessoning, previous experience, and social structure, were the preparative factors. Even Herr Chamberlain can see, at a pinch, that there are such factors. "It is altogether erroneous," he informs us in a footnote (i. 8) "to think that one must attribute such effects [moral developments] not to the awakened soul life but merely to race: the Bosniac of pure Servian descent and the Macedonian of Grecian stock are, as Mohammedans, just as fatalistic and anti-individualistic in their mode of thinking as any Osmanli whatever." Exit, then, the doctrine of race. But, expelled in a footnote, it re-enters in the text; and we go on with the Teutonicity of the Teuton, and all the rest of it.

It belongs to the nature of a false or empty theory to involve perpetual contradictions; and this treatise of "Foundations" abounds with them. The author enjoys Homer and Euclid; so the Hellenic race, as aforesaid, was a good mixture. Homer's great merit was to make Gods freely, to fit his own fancy, though his creed was "as Rohde says, 'almost freethinking'" (p. 7). But Herr Chamberlain reacts against Greek conduct and morals, noting that all Greeks, ancient and modern alike, have been selfish, unpatriotic, and untruthful, and that "humanity, generosity, pardon, were as foreign to them as love of truth." These traits they met "for the first time in the Persians" (i. 61). The fact that the Persians failed to come to anything in particular is nevertheless prudently excluded from the general exposition; and the alleged fact that "the whole of Greek history is filled with the mutilation not only of corpses but of living people, torture, and every kind of cruelty, falsehood, and treachery" is as little quadrated with the theoretic statement of Greek services to civilisation. Of the Hellenic case as a whole we learn simply that "The Greeks fell, their wretched



characteristics ruined them, their morality was already too old, too subtle, and too corrupt to keep pace with the enlightenment of their intellect" (i. 68). They went wrong because they chose to. "O Hellenes!" says our philosopher, in his "incomparable style," "if only you had remained true to the religion of Homer and the artistic culture which it founded! If you had but trusted your divine poets, and not listened to your Heraclitus and Xenophanes, your Socrates and Plato, and all the rest of them!" *Und so weiter.*

It thus appears that the Greeks went to moral perdition through the use of their reasoning and critical faculties—unless, indeed, we are to credit Socrates and Plato with the triumph of demonic superstition. Neither cause appears to be assigned for the downfall of "the Romans," who figure as a good racial mixture, in every way superior to the unspeakable Carthaginians. These last, it seems, were by nature sexually vicious to the last degree, though it does not seem to have struck Juvenal that his countrymen were notably otherwise. But while we are to be devoutly thankful that the Romans were not as the Phœnicians (else we to-day should have been we know not what!), we are to recognise that the Romans went down because they perversely ceased to be Roman. Dogs will go mad, in short. Things went well "so long as they were not in the hands of professional politicians. Cæsar's period was the most confused and most productive of evil; *both people and instinct were then dead, but the work continued to exist*" (i. 122). And, strange to say, non-Romans, like the Spaniard Trajan, outdid Romans in Romanity: "Roman imperialism [albeit dead] *came to be conscious of itself*, and that in a manner which was only possible in the minds of *nobly-thinking foreigners*, who found themselves face to face with a strange idea. . . ." Still, somehow, things went wrong after all; and "Caracalla, the murderous pseudo-Punic savage," settled the matter by extending the franchise to all, thus "cutting the last thread of historical tradition, *i.e.*, of historical truth. . . . Political law was, of course, henceforth the same for all: it was the equality of absolute lawlessness."

After this lucid handling of antiquity, a reader begins to harbour misgivings even about the all-civilising Teuton, with his "moral Aryanism," to say nothing of the hopeless peoples who harbour a "moral non-Aryanism" (p. 94). For we have it from our "conscious Teuton" that

"the principle of historical instruction is still everywhere in Europe systematic misrepresentation While the achievements of our own country are always empha-



sized" [even by the conscious Teuton!] "those of others passed over or suppressed, certain things put always in the brightest light, others left in the deepest shadow, there is found a general picture which in many parts differs only for the subtlest eye from naked lies. The foundation of all genuine truth, the absolutely disinterested love of justice, is almost everywhere absent,—a proof that we are still barbarians!" (i, 64).

Or Greeks, strangers to truth? And yet, as early as the year 1200, "we" had begun "the founding of commerce on the thoroughly Teutonic basis of stainless uprightness" (p. lxxxxi). "We," in short, are at the mercy of the moods and tempers of Herr Chamberlain. Races are good or bad as they or individuals of them happen to please him. Making a self-denying effort to be impartial, he finds certain good qualities in the Jews (though all Semites are a species of "mulatto," and therefore open to the darkest suspicions, like the Chilians and Peruvians). But as he sees "in the revelation of Christ the one foundation of all moral culture" (i, 197)—albeit the Teutonic nations mostly conduct their ethical teaching in the universities on the basis of Aristotle—he feels bound to prove that "Christ was not a Jew." The Galileans were a heathen stock, and "the probability that Christ was no Jew, that He had not a drop of genuinely Jewish blood in His veins, is so great that it is almost equivalent to a certainty." But "To what race did He belong? This is a question that cannot be answered at all" (i, 212). For once Herr Chamberlain is agnostic, even on a question of race.

The second part of the book, kaleidoscopically handling European civilisation "from the year 1200 to the year 1800," is less unprofitable than the first; but while it contains a vast amount of often suggestive commentary and discussion, it equally fails to attain anything like scientific elucidation. The author naturally finds no final comfort in his arbitrary doctrine of race. After all the introductory dismissal of the abandoned Greeks, he presents to us such an unsolved dilemma as this:—Schiller had asked "What single man of recent times stands forth, man against man, to contend with the individual Athenian for the prize of humanity?" and our Teuton replies:

"I should take Friedrich Schiller himself by the hand and place him in the midst of the greatest Greeks of all ages: stripped in the gymnasium the ever-ailing poet would certainly cut a poor figure, but his heart and intellect . . . would rise in the greater sublimity; and without fear of contradiction (!) I would boldly assert: this single man is superior to you all by his knowledge, his striving, his ethical ideal: as a thinker he is far above you (!) and as a poet almost of equal rank with you (!). What Hellenic artist, I ask, can be called Richard Wagner's equal in creative force and power of expression? . . ."

But again :

"Schiller supports the view that while we as individuals cannot rival the Greeks, our culture as a whole is superior to theirs. A decided mistake, behind which the phantom of 'humanity' again lurks. . . . The Hellenes, in spite of all the painful defects of their individuality, stands on an altitude of supreme eminence and reveal a peculiar harmony of greatness, from which their culture derives its charm, whereas we Teutons are still in process of development, self-contradictory" (truly !) "uncertain of ourselves, surrounded and at many points saturated to the core by incongruous elements which tear down what we construct and estrange us from our own true nature . . ." (ii, 220-2).

The case may fitly be left at that : the passage is certainly a fair description of Herr Chamberlain's book, which thus turns to naught, once more, his ostensible thesis. It contains much multiform and un-coordinated knowledge, much strenuous declamation, much turbid reasoning ; yet it amounts at best to a diffuse and vehement exposition of its author's opinions on things in general. As a contribution to sociology, it is an eloquent fiasco. It is to be feared that even the alleged "incomparable style" will not withhold some Prussian Teutons from diagnosing Herr Chamberlain as un-German—in fact, English. Some have actually so condemned him. On "race" principles, he might perhaps more fitly be labelled Italian, as his book conforms notably to the ruling tendencies of modern Italian writing in its thriftless volubility. He seems to do his thinking in the process of writing, penning every step in his cerebral processes as they occur. Hence, perhaps, the hand-to-mouth character of the reasoning, the unsolved and apparently unperceived contradictions, the swamping floods of rhetoric. He has certainly written a book signally lacking in the qualities of co-ordination for which we look in a German scientific treatise. But he has found an immense German public for a large and expensive book ; and it will be interesting to note how his general Teutonism succeeds in the British circles which combine an anti-Germanism of their own with habits of mind and bias very like Herr Chamberlain's.

J. M. ROBERTSON.

## HEREDITY AND THE SOCIAL OUTLOOK.\*

These five volumes, and others besides, all published in the last few months, reveal a fact of no inconsiderable significance to the social student, because they mark the unconscious recognition by the modern mind that the discussion of and investigation into the supremacy of the hereditary factor, sharply contested for the last thirty years by Neo-Lamarckians, is now over. All these writers accept the supremacy of heredity in human life; all give to their books titles which assign to heredity the chief place, and most of them use words of enthusiasm, at times a little beyond what the evidence warrants, to support their claim. "Social science" writes Dr. Herbert, "rightly understood, is based on two factors, heredity and evolution" and this rather anomalous remark—for heredity is of course one factor in the process of evolution, and evolution is not a factor at all—seeks to claim for heredity an importance which is only shared by one other influence, and Dr. Reid's statement that "no problems can be named of greater importance to the community than those of heredity," which is no doubt substantially a correct opinion, expresses the same faith.

The importance of these volumes is therefore this—that they reflect the growing unanimity of thought on this subject—a subject in itself very old. There is no time in medical history, and probably no known time in lay thought, when problems of heredity have not received some attention. And ever since Dr. Henry Maudsley drew attention to the predominant importance of heredity in social and individual life, and Sir Francis Galton focussed attention on the racial aspect of human heredity by the use of such words as "stirpiculture" and "eugenics" and by his introspective psychological methods, the ultimate public recognition of the heredi-

\*"The Laws of Heredity." By G. Archdall Reid, M.B., F.R.S.E. Methuen, 21/- net.

"Phases of Evolution and Heredity." By Dr. Berry Hart, M.D., F.R.S.E. Rebman, 5/- net.

"The First Principles of Heredity." By S. Herbert, M.D., M.R.C.S. Black, 5/- net.

"Hereditary Characters and their Modes of Transmission." By C. R. Walker, M.Sc., M.R.C.S. Edward Arnold, 8/6 net.

"Heredity in the Light of Recent Research." By L. Doncaster, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1/- net.

tary factor has only been a question of a few years. Accepting this recognition as unquestionable, and now inevitable, one may echo the hope of a recent critic that a true sense of the real danger of wrong ideas being disseminated on this subject may be early recognised, and that neither fashion, prejudice, class, nor personal feelings will be allowed to intervene in the search for truth. The economists of last century greatly exaggerated the economic factor while they virtually disregarded geographical, biological, and educational ones; and, speaking as one who has made biology his main study, one may hope that the hereditary aspect of the question will not be exaggerated or its real importance be overstated. There are so many vital issues at stake—such for instance (to name only two) as the relations of moral responsibility to heredity; the personal ideal of affection in marriage and the effect on this ideal of the racial eugenic need—that the very greatest accuracy in data and thought should be exercised.

That the warning is not uncalled for may be proved by a single example—many more could easily be given—from the very critic above referred to, a critic moreover writing in one of the most reliable British Reviews and one whose thought clearly suggests that he has given, as a lay student, much attention to his subject. Although himself drawing attention to the danger in question, he cites examples of "feeble-minded," "maniacs," "epileptic," and "ricketty" persons, as well as those afflicted by some monstrosity in growth, as if these were parallel examples for eugenic study, when as a matter of unquestionable fact they should be all separately classified and investigated. "Feeble-minded" persons are usually born so and the cause is probably hereditary; maniacs may have been born with unhealthy, or extreme, mental instability, or may be the result of hurtful social influences; epileptics are a better class because the word "epileptic" has a scientific meaning, whereas "maniac" is only a popular word for perhaps thirty or forty disorders; rickets is probably a dietetic disease and not hereditary at all, while monstrosities, in some instances at least, are caused by accidental mischances in development. The same writer seems to suggest that microcephalic idiocy, a quite hopeless form of imbecility, might be associated with genius. And it is gravely declared as a problem for the eugenicist to consider whether "it is safe to eradicate the root of nervous disease from the germ-plasm of the race"; as if among the hundred or more distinct nervous diseases affecting differently different parts, and often different tissues, of the nervous system, there were some means of removing all forms

of disease susceptibility, healthy and unhealthy, from the race. If there is not some check placed upon this kind of public treatment of the question very serious national dangers will soon be ahead of us. All medical men are not, of course, competent to speak or write on this subject; but it is very doubtful whether even a clever and cultivated man who has only theoretical knowledge, and is acquainted neither with practical physiology nor practical breeding experiments, or who has no practical intimacy with human and animal disease, can form even an approximately accurate opinion unguided. This fact is the real justification for works on heredity by competent writers and reviews by competent critics, for it is extremely doubtful if an elementary knowledge of the broad essentials of the study is possessed by the moderately cultured man or woman, and not a few biological enquiries are being made and published by men and women who are not informed on the most obvious and necessary biological principles and data.

The five books under consideration should help us all to clearer and more trustworthy conclusions, and the useful glossaries of terms which are given by four of the writers are perhaps a vague hint to both reviewer and reader to be a little cautious in drawing inferences on a subject which may be almost new to them.

Mr. Doncaster's work is a pleasant little volume—well arranged, well illustrated, simply written and cheap, dealing popularly with recent thought about inheritance. It is, however, a little too obviously Mendelian in its tone, and for this reason has not quite the fairness of presentation either of Lock, or, in a fuller way, of Thomson. With this caution it may be commended as useful.

Dr. Berry Hart's chatty "Phases of Evolution and Heredity" is accurately described by its title; although perhaps "thoughts on" rather than "phases of" might have given a still better suggestion of its contents. Certain points which have personally interested the author have been dwelt upon at length, and the work is therefore largely an expression of the author's outlook and is not truly representative of modern thought. Thus three chapters are devoted to the subject of bees, another to "The Handicap of Sex," another to the "Evolution of Religious Belief" and the last to "Men who have Revealed Themselves." The book, nevertheless, is useful as expressing a point of view.

Dr. Herbert's "First Principles of Heredity"—a title which, like Reid's "Laws of Heredity" and his former "Principles of Heredity," is certainly a good deal premature—is a more comprehensive and on the whole trustworthy volume that can be recom-



mended as an introduction to the subject. It has useful chapters introductory to the main subject, is plainly written, well planned and usefully illustrated, and the space allotted to each field of heredity is very well chosen. One would perhaps have liked to see a chapter on the social significance of heredity, which would add greatly to the living interest of the volume, while another chapter might very well have considered the relative value of mathematical, experimental and cumulative observational methods in research corresponding to the biometrical, Mendelian, and medical observers' modes of inquiry. The book is, however, one that may be accepted as being fair and well informed.

Dr. Walker's book is more suitable to the research student than to the general reader, and its bearing on sociology is only indirect. He has, however, made a careful examination of our knowledge of cell life (cytology), both in this and in a former book, and it is from this aspect that he approaches his study. His work is original and careful, but only a fellow cytologist can adequately judge its value. The main contention that hereditary characteristics fall naturally into two classes, racial and individual, and that natural selection acts upon the individual variations, will be an important contribution to knowledge if further work confirms Dr. Walker's conclusions. And it might have some very direct social bearings, but at the moment it is too early to discuss them.

Dr. Reid's work remains to be referred to and here one suffers from a wealth of material that is a little embarrassing. Our author is a prolific writer who, since his first important work published in 1896, "The Present Evolution of Man,"\* has devoted himself to the investigation of man's hereditary relation to his surroundings. Each of his books is an amplification of the ideas he originally gave prominence to in his earlier work, and this repetition is both a loss and a gain. His similar expressions and thoughts restated in succeeding volumes become a little wearisome, and to the reader who is already acquainted with his ideas there is a danger that what is new matter may be overlooked. Many of Dr. Reid's theories would repay much more careful and close inquiry than he gives them, and his wide range of thought would be greatly increased in value if he were to study each of the theories in greater detail. At the same time Dr. Reid, by this repetition, has caused many people to pause and give attention to the medical outlook who would otherwise have passed it by. To the sociologist his views are of

\* The title of a chapter in the present work.



peculiar importance because alcohol, disease, and man's power of educability are subjects that are central in the social horizon, and whether we agree with the treatment of them in this volume or not, we must form some opinion on the points raised.

His view, briefly stated, is that alcohol, opium, and the poisons of diseases are the *only* powerful and stringent selective agencies affecting civilised man on the side of his hereditary endowment; that, apart from this, man's main opportunity for progress lies not in hereditary differences varying in different individuals but in the more general power possessed by human beings at large to respond to cultural possibilities. Hence, after the acquisition of a natural immunity from disease and narcotics by the race, he would attach the greatest importance to the utilization of human tradition, of social inheritance, on sound educational lines in national life. It is not possible to deny that there is much in the view Dr. Reid presents; neither is it possible not to see that he uses words very vaguely and makes claims that suffer because his thought is vaguely applied to fact. Let us look a little more closely at each of his main contentions.

#### DISEASE.

The broad facts upon which Dr. Reid bases his chief arguments cannot, I think, be seriously disputed. It is a fact that while war was a frequent factor in pre-civilized man it has tended with the advance of civilization to claim a relatively smaller and smaller toll of citizens, and that death from disease in some form, alcoholic and parasitic, is the main cause of loss of life in higher communities. Whether disease is a more or less active factor in primitive than in civilized life is, however, open to question. Dr. Reid claims that as the disease factor in civilization is the main one, it must be evolution against disease that the civilized peoples undergo. He seems to imply that the aggregating of people together for social life favours the increase of diseases, and that, as a result of this, susceptible persons are destroyed by disease, leaving the resistant ones to survive and breed an immune race. Further, he claims that there is little or no evidence for the origin of new diseases, so that civilized man tends to become more and more insusceptible to disease in its various forms. Again, he seems to hold that the elimination of individuals has little or nothing to do with their social or anti-social capacities; hence there is no evidence of a higher type of man and woman being selected as a result of disease destruction.

Now in this series of hypotheses there is one sure basis of fact, namely, that on the whole as civilization advances a relatively, not absolutely, greater number of people are destroyed by disease under advancing social life. There is also an assumption which can almost be taken for granted, that with an increasingly dense population epidemic diseases, and possibly contagious diseases also, become more frequent. There the certainty ends. We have no trustworthy evidence that early man was in any measurable degree free from disease; on the contrary, the facts known to us are emphatically against such a belief. Bland Sutton and others have recorded instances of disease in animals and plants in a state of nature; and plants and animals under modern conditions—possibly under ancient conditions also, only we have no evidence—are extremely liable to disease. Where did these diseases come from? Not from man, because for the most part each type of organism has its distinctive diseases, clearly surviving from some antecedent natural state. Early man lived probably under conditions of great uncleanness and the shelters which he made for himself were exposed to all kinds of weather inclemencies. Tribes differ, it is true, a good deal in cleanliness, but this exposure was common to them all and they fed on coarse and often putrid food. In the absence of all reliable evidence what grounds have we for assuming that disease results mainly from man's becoming social? It is, of course, true that if there were no hygienic and medical treatment then civilization would have this effect of accentuating disease; and this explains, at least in part, why a primitive people is often devastated when it comes in contact with one more civilized. And it is no doubt also true, as Dr. Reid maintains, that newly introduced diseases attack a population with more intensity than old ones; but the truth of susceptibility and disease virulence does not disprove the value of hygiene.

Dr. Reid states that sanitary science has absolutely no control over air-borne disease. There is the tacit assumption here which Dr. Reid would admit—that sanitary science has some control over water-borne contagious diseases; but if so, what is the relation of hygienic to selective action in race evolution? Dr. Reid neither adequately asks nor answers even indirectly this question; yet hygienic precautions have been taken by man from the extreme beginnings of civilization right back to barbaric life, and the hygienic movement has accompanied, intensified, and extended its influence almost in degrees corresponding to man's advance. Hygiene protects from disease; it tends to favour the survival types

that under rougher conditions of life, under less cleanly conditions, would die. Where has hygiene been effective, and what has been its influence on the race? On this point Dr. Reid does not inform us. But sanitary science is not absolutely powerless even against air-borne diseases. The truth is that isolation methods, cleanliness, sanitation, and personal hygiene (*never yet efficiently practised*), though of some value, are insufficient protectors in an increasingly dense population, and they vary with the diseases given by Dr. Reid—some quite doubtfully, I should say—as air-borne. Measles is far more difficult to check than whooping-cough or mumps, and it is quite open to difference of medical opinion whether, if whooping-cough and mumps were notifiable, they might be eliminated from our population. Dr. Reid asserts that such diseases are “inevitable” in susceptible children, and that it is better for them to be “done with early in life,” although all recent medical evidence goes to show, not only that they are not inevitable, but that the effects of all diseases in early life are much more severe. Here, surely, a stronger charge than that of negligence might be brought against him; while to assume that no new diseases will arise or have arisen under changing social life, when disease germs must have undergone some modification in the past in order to become pathogenic at all, and to assume this merely because past disease history is so inadequately recorded as to make all discussion on the point difficult and untrustworthy, is not much better than speculation. Dr. Reid has pointed out that under certain conditions disease immunities are selected and become generalized in the population, and that these may have important results when the relatively immune people come in contact with the non-immune. For this we are indebted to him, but every step he has taken beyond it is unproved hypothesis. Nevertheless it cannot be doubted that he has presented a view which will require serious study. Let us pass more briefly to his next points.

#### ALCOHOL.

Our author's view of alcohol is open to many of the same objections as is his view of disease; it is one-sided, and runs a limited aspect of truth to death. No one with experience denies that some men are more readily affected by alcohol than others: no one will deny that some are more affected by the “charm” of alcohol as a drug than others, or that some men value the charm of its taste more than its drug action. It is an obvious medical

fact that alcohol, opium, and certain other drugs can be taken in increasing doses by those using them; that is to say, toleration of the drug to no inconsiderable extent can be acquired. It is quite certain also that some persons die early from the effects of its continual and extreme action. It is not improbable, therefore, that some selective action in regard to certain types of individuals has taken place. But is this the principal factor? Let us look first at the various points that need definitely studying before Dr. Reid's position can even to this extent be approved.

*Objection 1.*—*No evidence, that I am aware of, exists to show that men who like alcohol for its drug action are also those who are specially susceptible to its influence.* As a medical man I know from my own direct experience that extreme susceptibility to the drug's action, where this is not associated with a liking for the drug, may act as a deterrent, and many men very resistant to its influence take such large quantities that they at last are affected by it and die often after being parents of extremely large families. If Dr. Reid rejects, as he appears to do, the deteriorative action of alcohol on the germ tissue of such people, there is nothing for him to conclude but that at this point the selective action of alcohol ceases to be effective. Again, if it should happen that a type is arising that has a distinct psychological dislike to any effect of drugs on the mind, this type would reject alcohol, quite apart from whether it is susceptible or not. And yet again, I think most medical men will agree with me in believing that at least some not inconsiderable proportion of drinkers take alcohol because eating, drinking and physical pleasures appeal to them, while others abstain because physical pleasures are so subordinate to mental pleasures that their activities and desires are developed in mental directions. That a certain number of men drink because of industrial customs there cannot be the slightest doubt, for the daily observation of patients, quite apart from statistics, makes this a certainty. That there is a convivial drinker and an industrial drinker, speaking generally, as Dr. Sullivan maintains, must be admitted. Now although this view may be in part acceptable to Dr. Reid, it yet does materially alter his point of view; for unless he can show that the type which has become largely immune by hereditary selection is the predominant one, his position becomes relatively less important, as this type of drinker is found to be less the rule and more the exception.

*Objection 2.*—Dr. Reid shows very successfully that many moderate nations have been long used to alcohol; but what, to

my mind, he is much less convincing upon is the absence of use in former times in those who now take alcohol to excess.

*Objection 3.*—Unless it can be established,—and I fail to see the possibility of such an assumption,—that alcohol is not a drug which “physiologically” acts first on the higher centres of the brain and the higher powers of the mind, and slowly extends its influence to lower and lower nerve structures, alcohol will always be an undesirable drug to take, and will be condemned on this ground alone. As alcohol visibly acts in this way, and needs no further demonstration to prove this aspect of its action, this argument against the taking of alcohol as a beverage must be all but final. There are so many opinions on alcohol that it is greatly to be desired that some discussion of the whole question should be faced fairly and honestly by the various investigators in the field.

#### EDUCATION.

The last of Dr. Reid's theories turns on the views he holds in regard to the general educability of man. He assumes that certain bodily structures develop mainly under the stimulus of nutriment, and that others, such as our muscles and brain cells, develop under the stimulus of use. I do not know of any evidence in support of this contention, except the one fact that muscles can enlarge under exercise, and that certain organs—not the brain, by the way,—can increase in size and capacity when extra functional demands are made upon them. It has been known for many years that this response power exists in certain tissues; that it is lacking in insects, exists in birds, still more in mammals, and most in man, is also recognised, but that muscular tissue grows in any definite relation to its usage, or that mind capacity depends on mind culture is not proved, and, I think, never likely to be. Now there are other obvious facts of life, just as obvious as the assumed increase in growth from use. For example, of two brothers in a family, one living a sedentary life, the other an outdoor one full of muscular demands, the sedentary brother is not infrequently the stronger. One such instance is enough to destroy Dr. Reid's premises. In hysterical patients confined to bed it is simply astonishing how well both the size, tone, and vigour of the electrical reaction is preserved after many years. Nor is there evidence to prove, or even to make probable, that the quality of a mind improves by use. Knowledge is power, and a mind of fine quality badly educated may be beaten by one of



poorer quality better informed. The fact explains much in Japan's sudden awakening to Western culture—not, be it noted, to culture of both East and West—from a state of ignorance. And the supposition that talent and natural capacity are subordinate to education simply will not fit any large number of facts of daily experience. Of two brothers—to use the instance once more—born in the same home, educated at the same school, both going to the same college, one will keep his original tastes, while the other abandons them. The evidence in regard to twins, as published by Dr. Maudsley and Sir Francis Galton, is to the same effect; it shows beyond dispute the close relation between nature and capacity, and assigns to nurture a useful but secondary place. Maudsley's name is not mentioned in the index of Dr. Reid's book, nor is Sir Francis Galton's study of twins included; yet it is such evidence as this which tells most heavily against Dr. Reid's own beliefs.

In conclusion, Dr. Reid's study of heredity is interesting, it is suggestive, it is often original, it is certainly partly true; but the truth which it contains is more limited than he believes, and there are many very dangerous fallacies in his work. Hereditary immunity from disease may be one factor in racial progress, but it is not the sole one, as sanitary science has quite certainly had a different effect. Hereditary immunity from alcohol may be one factor in social amelioration, but there are others, probably quite as important. Man's response power to physical and mental education is a generally known fact, but education without some type opportunity would be a gross injustice. Dr. Reid challenges large social forces when he touches these questions, and it must be admitted that he challenges them often without due appreciation of the demands of his subject. But no one can fail to read his writings without interest, and it is just because these questions are so large and so important that the need for clear thinking and direct appeal to facts is always necessary. We are none the less indebted to him for his interesting work.

J. LIONEL TAYLER.



## SIR FRANCIS GALTON.

[Sir Francis Galton, F.R.S., who died on January 17 last, was born on February 16, 1822, and was therefore within a month of completing his 89th year. He was the son of a Birmingham banker by a daughter of Erasmus Darwin, and he married, in 1853, a daughter of Dean Butler, of Peterborough. His work in science took him into many fields, for he was explorer and geographer, anthropologist and biologist, biometrecian and meteorologist, and finally the originator of Eugenics. He invented the word "anti-cyclone," and devised the graphic method of recording weather changes familiar to everyone through the daily charts in the *Times*. He introduced, in 1875, the process of verifying thermometers and certifying watches now in common use, and his name is associated with the early applications of the finger-print system. His anthropological studies led him to inquire into the inheritance of physical characteristics, and in 1869 he published "Hereditary Genius," the first of the series of monographs forming his distinctive title to fame as an initiator. Other volumes were: "English Men of Science: their Nature and Nurture," 1874; "Human Faculty," 1883; "Natural Inheritance," 1889; and, in collaboration with Dr. Edgar Schuster, "Noteworthy Families (Modern Science)," 1906. In his Huxley Lecture (1901) on "The Possible Improvement of the Human Breed under existing conditions of Law and Sentiment," he gave a first form to the eugenic ideas afterwards developed before the Sociological Society. Honours, even scientific honours, came to Galton very late in life. He was 87 when he received his knighthood. In the most commonly consulted book of biographical reference he characteristically put down his recreations as "sunshine, quiet, and good wholesome food."]

SOME months ago there was formed in Birmingham a society for the study of heredity in its bearings upon the human race, and the opportunity of giving the inaugural address fell to me. It was soon after Sir Francis Galton's death, and one could not lecture on heredity without feeling intellectual as well as personal bereavement. Moreover, it was in Birmingham that Galton was born, in 1822, which was also the year of the birth of Mendel,—an interesting coincidence. As one looked at a large and keen audience, and noted the presence of many of the well-known intellectual combatants of the town, one realised vividly how much Galton had achieved. The society, the audience, the platform, the available data for discussion—fruits of time they were, of course,—but how much was owing to Galton himself! Biologically, we cannot but regret that a man of his genius and lineage left no children, but we have to remember his intellectual heirs,—the number of men at present actively at work in the investigation of what was after all the central problem of Galton's life,—the possible improvement of the human breed.

It must surely have been a great satisfaction to Sir Francis Galton to witness the development of the fundamental ideas which he contributed to the study of heredity. It may be useful to recall very briefly the three greatest of these. (1) Independently of Weismann, Galton long ago expressed (1875), what has since been so well substantiated, the idea of the germinal continuity of generations,—our main clue to understanding why like tends to beget like. (2) Galton was also one of the prompters of the extremely useful modern scepticism as to the transmission of somatic modifications. We particularly associate this with the name of Weismann, but in 1875 Galton expressed the firm conviction "that acquired modifications are barely, if at all, *inherited* in the correct sense of that word." (3) Even greater, perhaps, was the service Galton did in showing that exact quantitative methods can be applied to the study of inheritance. In his "Law of Regression" he showed that if we take, in a stable population, mating at random, a group of all the parents with the same amount of a character, say stature, then the average of the same character in their offspring will be nearer to the mean of the whole population than the parental value was. In his "Law of Ancestral Heredity," he stated that the degree of resemblance to successive grades of the ancestry diminishes in a geometrical progression. What form and position these two great contributions will eventually occupy in the framework of a science of heredity, it is difficult to say, but it seems clear, on grounds of commonsense, and from analogy with other sciences, that the employment of statistical methods in the study of human heredity is not merely useful, but indispensable.

In this informal note I may be allowed to give an instance of Galton's remarkable kindness. More than twenty years ago I had occasion to expound some elementary conceptions in regard to heredity, insisting in particular on defining it as *the genetic relation between successive generations*,—a relation which is sustained by a visible material basis (the germ-cells), a relation of resemblances and differences which can be measured and weighed, or in some way computed. I was seeking to get away from a kind of phraseology, common at the time, which seemed needlessly loose, which spoke of heredity as a power, or as a principle, or as a force, which always spelt the word with a capital "H." I was seeking to show that the organism and its inheritance are, to begin with, one and the same, that the inheritance includes all that the organism is, or has, to start with in virtue of its genetic relation to its parents, and that the concept of heredity includes that of variability instead of being in antithesis to it. The present point, however, is simply that Galton was then good enough to write expressing his approbation of my essay and my attempted definition. This was a kindness that meant much to me at the time, and it was only the first of many.

J. ARTHUR THOMSON.

## GALTON AND THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Between Sir Francis Galton and the Sociological Society there existed a peculiarly interesting relationship, in that during the first months of our existence, in 1904, the veteran founder of the study of Eugenics came out of his retirement in order to read before the Society the series of papers from which we may definitely date the beginning of the movement now so widely and variously supported. It will be within the recollection of the members that these papers, read at meetings held in the London School of Economics and Political Science, aroused a quite extraordinary amount of interest, and started a discussion which carried the knowledge of the new science far beyond the limits of the scientific world.

The first paper of the series was read on May 16, 1904, Professor Karl Pearson being in the Chair. The title was "Eugenics: its Definition, Scope, and Aims," and in his opening sentence Sir Francis Galton defined Eugenics as "the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage." Its aim, he explained, was to bring to bear as many influences as could reasonably be employed, so as to enable the useful classes in the community to contribute more than their proportion to the next generation. The following steps were urged as necessary to this end:—

1. Dissemination of a knowledge of the laws of heredity, so far as they are surely known, and promotion of their further study.
2. Historical inquiry into the rates at which the various classes of society (classified according to civic usefulness) have contributed to the population at various times, in ancient and modern nations.
3. Systematic collection of facts, showing the circumstances under which large and thriving families have most frequently originated; in other words, the *conditions* of Eugenics.
4. Study of the influences affecting Marriage.

The paper, together with the remarkably representative discussion to which it gave rise among eminent members and correspondents of the Society, appears in the first volume of *Sociological Papers* (1904). As a step towards a compilation of a "Golden Book of Thriving Families," which he counselled the students of Sociology to undertake, Galton contributed to the same volume a note on his method of eugenic investigation as applied to the achievements of persons nearly related to certain Fellows of the Royal Society; and to this he appended an abstract of the record of several typical families—*e.g.*, the Booths, Burdon-Sandersons, Haldanes, Darwins, Galtons, Wedgwoods, Palgraves, Roscoes, Stracheys.

Galton's second paper, on "Restrictions in Marriage," was read before the Society on February 14, 1905, Dr. E. Westermarck presiding. It was designed to meet an objection repeatedly urged against the possible adoption of any system of Eugenics, namely,

that human nature would never tolerate any interference with the freedom of mating. Touching briefly upon existing marriage customs—monogamy, endogamy, exogamy, prohibited degrees, etc.—Galton pointed out how powerful are the various combinations of immaterial motives upon marriage, and how they may all become hallowed by religion, accepted as custom, and enforced by law. "Persons who are born under their various rules live under them without any objection. They are unconscious of their restrictions as we are unaware of the tension of the atmosphere." Galton concluded by expressing the view that few things are more needed in England than a revision of our religion, "to adapt it to the intelligence and needs of the present time."

To the same meeting of the Sociological Society Galton communicated, *à propos* of the first appointment to the Galton Research Fellowship in National Eugenics, a list of subjects which he proposed as suitable to eugenic inquiry; and in replying upon the large body of international opinion brought together by the editors of *Sociological Papers*, he appended a note on Eugenics as a factor in religion (Vol. 2., p. 52). He contended that Eugenics strengthens the sense of social duty in so many important particulars that the conclusions derived from its study ought to find a welcome in every tolerant religion. And he ended with these words:—

Eugenic belief extends the function of philanthropy to future generations; it renders its action more pervading than hitherto, by dealing with families and societies in their entirety, and it enforces the importance of the marriage covenant by directing serious attention to the probable quality of the future offspring. It sternly forbids all forms of sentimental charity that are harmful to the race, while it eagerly seeks opportunity for acts of personal kindness, as some equivalent to the loss of what it forbids. It brings the tie of kinship into prominence, and strongly encourages love and interest in family and race. In brief, Eugenics is a virile creed, full of hopefulness, and appealing to many of the noblest feelings of our nature.

---

### THE GALTON BEQUEST.

Sir Francis Galton left his residuary estate (about £45,000) to the University of London for the purpose of encouraging the study of national Eugenics. A codicil, dated May 25, 1909, was in the following terms:—

I devise and bequeath all the residue of my estate and effects, both real and personal, unto the University of London for the establishment and endowment of a professorship at the said University to be known as "The Galton Professorship of Eugenics," with a laboratory or office and library attached thereto. And I declare that the duty of the professor shall be to pursue the study and further the knowledge of national Eugenics—that is, of the agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial faculties of future generations physically and mentally. And for this purpose I desire that the University shall, out of the income of the above endowment, provide

the salaries of the professor and of such assistants as the Senate may think necessary, and that the professor shall do the following acts and things—namely:—

1. Collect materials bearing on Eugenics.
2. Discuss such materials and draw conclusions.
3. Form a Central Office to provide information, under appropriate restrictions, to private individuals and to public authorities concerning the laws of inheritance in man, and to urge the conclusions as to social conduct which follow from such laws.
4. Extend the knowledge of Eugenics by all or any of the following means, namely:—(a) professional instruction; (b) occasional publications; (c) occasional public lectures; (d) experimental or observational work which may throw light on eugenic problems.

He shall also submit from time to time reports of the work done to the authorities of the said University.

I also declare that the said University shall be at liberty to apply either the capital or income of the said moneys for any of the purposes aforesaid, but it is my hope that the University will see fit to preserve the capital thereof wholly or almost wholly intact, not encroaching materially upon it for cost of building, fittings or library. Also that the University will supply the laboratory or office at such place as its Senate shall from time to time determine, but preferably in the first instance in proximity to the Biometric Laboratory. I state these hopes on the chance of their having a moral effect upon the future decisions of the Senate of the University, but they are not intended to have any legally binding effect whatever upon the freedom of their action. And I declare that it shall be lawful for the Senate of the said University, if they shall think fit so to do, to postpone the election of the first or any subsequent professor of Eugenics for a period of not exceeding four years from the date of my death, or from the date of the occurrence of any vacancy in the office as the case may be. . . .

I declare it to be my wish, but I do not impose it as an obligation, that on the appointment of the first professor the post shall be offered to Professor Karl Pearson, and on such conditions as will give him liberty to continue his Biometric Laboratory now established at University College.



## NOTES.

THE small Cities Exhibition, arranged under the superintendence of Professor Geddes, has justified its existence in an altogether striking fashion since the last issue of this Review. Created, after the International Town-planning Conference last autumn, mainly

**The Itinerant  
Cities  
Exhibition.**

out of the exhibits then displayed at Burlington House, it was revised and rehung at Crosby Hall, Chelsea, and opened by Mr. John Burns, in February, with an address which aroused widespread interest. The Exhibition was then taken to Edinburgh, where, after being thoroughly overhauled, revised, and developed, it was housed in the Galleries of the Royal Scottish Academy, under the auspices of the City Corporation. Opened on March 12, by the Lord Provost, whose address was followed by another from Lord Pentland, the Secretary for Scotland, it remained on view until April 1, having been seen by some 17,000 people. In the mornings the galleries were open especially to teachers and school children; the paying public was admitted in the afternoons, and in the evenings the galleries were filled with a crowd of mostly working men and women, a large proportion of whom made a systematic tour of the Exhibition under the expert guidance of Professor Geddes and his helpers.

The Exhibition was visited from day to day by prominent citizens of Edinburgh, and by representatives from many other important cities, North and South. A considerable number of lectures, afternoon and evening, were given in an adjoining hall to crowded audiences, the interest being maintained on a level which made it not only possible but advisable

**A Notable  
Success.**

on more than one occasion to provide two lectures on the same evening. These were all liberally reported by the Press. In the galleries the chief attraction was, naturally, the admirable collection of prints, drawings, photographs, and water-colours, illustrating the historic development of Edinburgh. This was arranged according to Professor Geddes's now well-known historico-sociological scheme, in fuller detail and with much greater completeness than the outline survey exhibited in London last October. The Edinburgh collection occupied the central room, the other rooms being utilized for the display, in historical sequence, of ancient, mediæval, and Renaissance cities, and their modern developments as illustrated by the unplanned labyrinth of London, the Haussmannized capitals of Europe, and the newest examples of reconstructed industrial centres, parks and gardens, garden villages and suburbs. These were skilfully hung so as continually to emphasize the sociological moral—by bringing out the differences between vital and destructive forms of development, the evidence of opportunities missed in times past and perils threatening to-day, or by suggesting means by which the values of historic cities may be preserved, recovered, or adapted to modern needs. It should be added that the organisers had the assistance of a keen

and intelligent group of volunteer guides, both men and women, who did excellent service in interpreting the exhibits. An explanatory catalogue, containing much illustrative reference and suggestion, was compiled by Professor Geddes and Mr. Mears. As already explained, the idea of the collection is that it should form the nucleus of an educational Cities Exhibition, to be taken from place to place. It goes next month to Dublin, and negotiations with other cities are in progress as we go to press. There is a possibility also that it may return to London in the summer.

THE arrangements for the first Universal Races Congress, to be held at the University of London from July 26 to 29, are nearing completion. A meeting was held last month of representatives from some 60 London

### **The Universal Races Conference.**

Societies, at which the aims and purposes of the Congress were explained by Sir Edward Brabrook, Mr. J. A. Hobson, Dr. Caldecott, and others, and energetic efforts are being made by the organisers to enlist the support, not of influential leaders alone, but of all individuals and groups interested in the problems of race contact and development. Dr. Margoliouth's lecture before the Sociological Society on April 4 was an illuminating statement and discussion of the principal subjects with which the Congress will be called upon to deal. Useful work has been done by securing the co-operation of the foreign Press correspondents in London. It is not possible at the present stage to form an estimate of the number of foreign and Colonial visitors, and of delegates from the coloured peoples, who may find it possible to be present, but hopes are entertained that many of those who will be in London in May and June for the Imperial Conference and the Coronation may be enabled to extend their stay until the assembling of the Congress. A small conference of representative Sociologists and Anthropologists will be held on the eve of the larger assembly.

In the School of Higher Studies of the National University of Mexico, recently founded, authoritative Professors are being engaged to give courses lasting each three months. Each lecturer has the title

### **The National University of Mexico.**

Professor, and he is required to reside at Mexico City for three months every year during his term of office. Among those already appointed on these terms are Professors Richet (Paris, Physiology), Capitan (Paris, Ethnology), Boas (New York, Anthropology), Rowe (Philadelphia, Political Science), Reiche (Germany, Botany), Baldwin (Baltimore, Philosophy and Social Science). Professor Baldwin opened the series with a course entitled "The Individual and Society," which is being followed by a seminary course. Professor Boas began in November, and Professor Richet in January. The qualifications for enrolment are graduation from a university school (college) and high honours in subjects related to that to be pursued. We learn that the first course given under these restrictions had an enrolment of fifty-five. It is expected that the Professors will devote their courses to research, as well as to instruction.

THE Agenda Club, which sprang into existence last year with remarkable rapidity, is now pleasantly housed in business premises at 28 Fleet Street.

We learn that it is getting to work on certain definite problems of the hour :  
such as emigration, sweating, industrial betterment,  
**The Agenda Club.** infant feeding, the provision of pure milk, the education of the agricultural labourer, national physical improvement, and the organisation of boys' clubs on co-operative lines. The promoters have already enrolled a large number of members, and are preparing a varied and extended programme to put before the first general meeting, to be held on May 4. The following quotations from the statements of their aims and methods will indicate the main purposes of the organisation to those of our readers who have missed the accounts of its early stages:—"There is an urgent need for the scientific and impartial investigation of those social and economic problems which are now dealt with mainly on controversial lines." "The Agenda Club is an association formed with the definite conviction that if the capacity, resourcefulness, research, ingenuity in presentation, economy of means, elaboration of method, courage and persistence which are applied daily to the production and distribution of the standard household commodities were applied to idealistic effort, to the task of getting things done which ought to be done, and which everyone would be glad to see done, we might hope to see a better and happier England." "It is particularly desirable to obtain the active help and expert advice, professional or technical, of all those men and women of good will who have specialized knowledge or ability which can be utilized in carrying into effect any programme adopted." The Agenda Club, if it fulfils the promise of its beginning, should develop into the first school of applied sociology in this country.

## REVIEWS.

## OLIVE SCHREINER ON WOMAN AND LABOUR.

"WOMAN AND LABOUR." By OLIVE SCHREINER. T. Fisher Unwin, 1911, 8/6 net.

FOLLOWING Mary Wollstonecraft's "Vindication," and J. S. Mill's "Subjection of Women," this book of Olive Schreiner's will rank as the classical utterance of the movement for the freedom of women in our time. For although it is only a fragment of a far larger work, with wider sociological scope, the manuscript of which was destroyed in Johannesburg where it had been left shortly before the outbreak of the war, the concentrated economic argument, here set forth with the wealth of illustration and of imagery which belongs to the genius of the writer, will give it a unique value for controversial and propagandist purposes.

The main argument is laid out upon broad simple lines. Woman is depicted in the beginnings of civilisation as the inventor and worker of the chief industrial arts, man being occupied mainly in fighting and hunting. Under more settled conditions woman still continued to retain a large share of agricultural and manufacturing work in and about the home, even the women of the wealthier classes finding in the skilled administration of a household (as Mrs. Putman shows in her interesting work "The Lady") ample scope for their skill and industry. But wherever the exploitation of the labour of slaves, or subject races or classes, has placed abundance of wealth at the disposal of a dominant class or race, so as to free it from the necessity of manual labour, the symptoms of female parasitism have appeared. For the males of the dominant class have tended to absorb to themselves the more intellectual occupations rendered possible by liberation from manual toil, and the females of this class have become more and more dependent on sexual functions alone for their life and livelihood. Such has been in the older civilisations the sole and sufficient origin of "the fine lady, the human female parasite—the most deadly microbe which can make its appearance on the surface of any social organism" (82). Prostitution is the last surviving "trade" for woman when these conditions are fully achieved. In Greece, Rome, Persia, Assyria, India, wherever forcible exploitation reached a certain point, "virile (sic!) labouring women in the upper classes were to be found no more." History shows how the mind and morals of women atrophied along with their bodies, and how the degradation sapped the character and the survival power of the race.

Wherever there has been "an accumulation of unearned wealth in the hands of the dominant class or race," this effect upon womanhood followed. Here Mrs. Schreiner might have more fully fortified her case by following the line of exposition so brilliantly pursued by Mr. Veblen in his "Theory of the Leisure Class," in which the necessity of female idleness is imposed as a result of the craving for male ostentation, an index of his personal or financial prowess. But until recent times methods of production did not render possible a wide

extension of such sex parasitism. The substitution of mechanical for human energy in the chief productive arts alone, argues Mrs. Schreiner, makes it possible and likely that this parasitism will spread downwards, until not only the middle-class women, but even the women of the poorer classes will find all their occupations gone. Such work as labour-saving machinery involves will pass chiefly to men, and unless the more intellectual fields are open equally to women as to men, "the whole bodies of females in civilised societies must sink into a state of more or less absolute dependence on their sexual functions alone." (115.) Finally, there is to be taken into account the fact that, with the decline of infant mortality and the reduced birthrate, women's work in maternity and the rearing of children is greatly diminished, aggravating the condition of idle dependency.

The thesis is set out with force and confidence. How much truth does it contain? As regards the life of the well-to-do classes in all centres of modern civilisation the contention is irrefutable. Most women of these classes pass lives either of idleness or of futile frivolity, contributing nothing useful to society in return for their expensive keep, and unable to allay the chronic discomfort they feel by the amusements and "social duties" they invent in their struggle against sheer torpor. But is this condition growing with the growth of wealth? No doubt it is true that with the last two generations in this country the productive activity of the middle-class household has become more meagre, as the last relics of home industries, *e.g.*, clothesmaking, washing, preserve-making, etc., have passed outside. But the peril of parasitism is certainly modified for those classes of women by the opening up of many new avenues of paid and unpaid activity. The development of modern commerce has thrown large new fields of employment into the hands of women; the lower grades of the professions, especially the educational and medical, and the fine arts, have enabled large numbers of middle-class women to break away from the sheltered home and win for themselves, if not a competency, at any rate a livelihood. As for the women of the wage-earning classes, though some of the manufactures which they pursued formerly within the home have been taken over by male labour in the factory, women have succeeded in holding a large number of them and in obtaining a large share of many of the newer industries. The notion that machinery necessarily tends to the detriment of female employment is unfounded, nor does it seem true that the net effect of modern industrial changes has been to reduce the total scope for female work. The real injury and injustice consist, here, not so much in imposing idleness upon a sex, as in imposing low conditions of employment with low remuneration. It is very unlikely that there is more "unemployment," in the sense of idleness, among the women than among the men of the poorer classes. That might indeed happen if a more general spread of high wages among males fostered among the workers an imitation of the sheltered conventional home of the middle classes, so that they kept their women at home not to work, not even to bring up children, but to be ornaments. But it cannot seriously be held that there is any tendency in this direction. Nothing but a rapid development of imperialism, accompanied by financial exploitation, enabling whole Western nations to live the life which is at present lived by well-to-do groups in Southern England, would make possible such an extension of female parasitism as Olive Schreiner seems to prognosticate.

The chief interest of this book for many readers, however, will lie in



the vigorous refutation of some of the staple objections against the woman's movement which it furnishes. An illuminating piece of reasoning is the chapter on "Women and War," in which Mrs. Schreiner insists that woman alone can understand the cost of war, because she has made the human material whose wastage is involved.

A not less interesting, though a more controversial, chapter deals with the capacities of women for sharing the higher kinds of work with men. The higher the type of occupation the less dependent is it upon the qualities of muscular strength and merely animal endurance in which man is admittedly superior. Woman, therefore, should be by nature adapted to the most highly skilled and intellectual work as well as, or even better than man. Though there is little valid evidence to go upon, Mrs. Schreiner contends that there is no reason to hold that physical sex differences have any disabling counterpart in the capacities required for the higher forms of work. The comparative failure of women in the few intellectual and artistic careers where they have had an approximately equal opportunity with men is not discussed, though it is surely relevant.

It is, however, by no means essential to the argument to contend that in most, or even any, of the higher occupations the average woman is the equal or the superior of man. If any women are better than some men in those occupations, social waste and injury, as well as injustice, are evidently involved in excluding them.

If sex differences are represented in capacities for the performance of higher kinds of work, it is likely that the exclusion of women involves the loss of certain special values, and that by such exclusion the very standards of such work are disturbed.

Finally, it is upon the plea for community of work as the basis of human comradeship and of the happier type of home and marriage, that the writer relies for her most powerful argument. Freedom and equality will not reduce the attractiveness of the sexes to one another. Those who think that intellectual and successful women will not be married, and so not transmit their qualities to the improvement of the race are not reckoning with what Mrs. Schreiner terms "the new man," who is springing up as the natural counterpart of the new woman.

Such are some of the main features of a powerful and original work whose insistent eloquence will arouse much fruitful controversy.

J. A. HOBSON.

---

#### THE ABBESS OF CHICAGO.

"THE SPIRIT OF YOUTH AND THE CITY STREETS," By JANE ADDAMS. New York: Macmillan, 1909. 5/6 net.

He must indeed be a dullard who does not recognise, a churl who does not welcome, the increasing social initiative of woman. The nurse and doctor and teacher who won their footing so hardly a generation ago, and who have since seemed, meekly and quietly for the most part, acceptant of their places in the established order of things, have meantime been attaining a comprehension of babe and child, of girl and boy, of body and mind, which now only awaits its effective and resolute spokeswoman to shake our large and complacently humming educational machine into the scrap-heap, as completely as Mrs. Webb and Mrs. Bosanquet are doing between them for the Poor Law. For when the

spear of Pallas is not merely threatening, as with the militant suffragists, but clearly aimed and sent fairly flying, there are more Bumbles than the traditional parish one who will be transfixed. But it is when the presence of the clear and stern-eyed Maid combines with that of the Mother compassionate, that there fully appears the Sacred Wisdom. And here in this small book is a fresh utterance of it, tender and true as ever of old. This appearance is appropriately from Chicago, which I take to be at once commonly and correctly regarded as, for too many of its inhabitants, one of the most dreadful cities of our modern industrial Inferno—destructive of body, deteriorative of soul.

The writer, still too little known in Europe, may be most briefly described as the Abbess of Chicago; already, like Hilda of Whitby, honoured in the councils of her nation. In more everyday terms, she is head of Hull House, admittedly the foremost University Settlement of Chicago, indeed of America—many would say of the world. Her house is of mixed membership, women and men together, like some of the earliest abbeys, and like Thelema; and its combined freedom and reserve, its mingled practicality and idealism, increasingly justify this co-operation of the sexes—one likely to become less uncommon.

Now for the book. What is its message, its value, which makes this reviewer at any rate seriously wish to see a second edition of a hundred thousand at sixpence, and then a third of a million at a penny? Its value lies in the simple and convincing way in which it fulfils the promise of its title, and shows us, not in Chicago only, but in each of our great cities, the streets astir, aflame, athrong with youth—the youth of the coming city and nation. Jane Addams cures us of our superciliousness and our pessimism; she makes us feel and see that these lasses and lads in their unnumbered thousands—rough and wild, coarse or careless as they may seem to us, are not really in search of the ignoble pleasure-traps which the streets as yet mainly provide, and into which they therefore so readily fall: what they have really started out for is the legitimate, the organic, the inevitable quest—the quest of life, of life more abundantly. Read the chapter on the Quest of Adventure, with its 15,000 young people under twenty who passed through the Chicago Courts last year, and all these as but an evidence of the innumerable subjective tragedies of the House of Dreams. Again, in the chapter on the Wrecked Foundations of Domesticity, she looks frankly at the sex-storms of adolescence; no longer in the old futile repressive ways, nor with the blinking ineffectiveness of prude and prig, of curate and moral philosopher, but as a woman should, with psychological insight and practical wisdom, conscious of their incomparable uplifting possibilities no less than of their deteriorative power. Yet all this with both tact and force combined, surely enough to arouse to conviction of sin, to repentance and good works, even the same respectable classes whom my less wise and gentle pen has just been singling out for oburgation. For in the American city, as Stevenson says of our own Scottish ones: "to the man of the people, especially if of artistic temperament, the Puritan has left no refuge but the public-house." So Miss Addams, almost in so many words:

"These coarse and illicit merrymakings remind us of the unrestrained jollities of the Restoration, London, and they are indeed their direct descendants, properly commercialised, still confusing joy with lust, and gaiety with debauchery. Since the soldiers of Cromwell shut up the people's playhouses and destroyed their pleasure-fields, the

Anglo-Saxon city has turned over the provision for public recreation to the most evil-minded and the most unscrupulous members of the community."

And again:

"Apparently the modern city sees in these girls only two possibilities, both of them commercial; first a chance to utilise by day their new and tender labour power in its factories and shops, and then another chance in the evening to extract from them their petty wages by pandering to their love of pleasure."

Enough now of her criticism of the city, her psychologic analysis of the Dionysiac spirit; a word remains for her remedies. First and foremost she makes her appeal to the artist, with clear perception of the total transformation this involves of our prevalent civilisation, from mammonist and mechanical to vital and creative,—in a word from palæotechnic to neotechnic. The modern American spirit of industry is not forgotten; still less the "thirst for righteousness," with which she shows again how youth is filled: an appreciation widened from her own inherited standpoint, of Puritanism at its best, through her sympathetic understanding of the ideals of all the heterogeneous peoples—literally "Jew and Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond and free," who seethe in the vast melting-pot of the Chicago slums, and throng her ever-open hospice of the soul and body. Here, then, at once from a woman's wit at its clearest, a heart at its fullest, is a needed book upon a great subject—a book which goes deeper and nearer to the heart of things than any or all of our current talk of Eugenics and Civics, much less of politics and affairs. Towards that thorough and joyous re-organisation and renewal of city life and city environment together, which becomes so manifestly urgent as our eyes open upon our present fools' paradises, there has been no clearer call since the passing of the prophet Ruskin.

P. GEDDES.

---

"TWENTY YEARS AT HULL HOUSE, with Autobiographical Notes." By JANE ADDAMS. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911. 10/6 net.

Here, in a book which is assured of a place among the noblest life records of the time, is the fitting companion volume to the one of which Professor Geddes writes in the foregoing notice. It is not formally autobiographic in method, but Miss Addams has the rare faculty of stating or implying the essential personal facts, in the fewest possible words, during the process of describing the experiences which led her to follow a certain course of public action, or showing the relation in which Hull House has stood to the political and economic forces of the past two decades. It is a wonderful and deeply moving record, the power and inspiration of which no reviewer can hope to reproduce.

We get, in the opening pages, an exquisite reminiscence of the Addams home at Cedarville, Illinois; a glimpse of the American worship of Lincoln; an account of the boarding-school ideals and the varied European influences which led, by ways not difficult to follow, to the founding of the settlement among the slums of Chicago. Halstead Street, in which Hull House stands, has a length of thirty-two miles.

"Polk Street crosses it midway between the stockyards to the south and the shipbuilding yards on the north bank of the Chicago River.

For six miles between these two industries the street is lined with shops and saloons. Polk Street running west becomes more prosperous; running a mile east to State Street it grows steadily worse, and crosses a network of vice on the corners of Clark Street and Fifth Avenue. . . . Between Halstead Street and the river live about 10,000 Italians, Neapolitans, Sicilians, and Calabrians, with an occasional Lombard or Venetian. To the south on Twelfth Street are many Germans, and side-streets are given over almost entirely to Polish and Russian Jews. Still further south, these Jewish colonies merge into a huge Bohemian colony, so vast that Chicago ranks as the third Bohemian city in the world."

Settlement life, still in its infancy in England, was in 1889 unknown in the United States and Miss Addams and her colleagues began work in an atmosphere of critical bewilderment, so far as observers were concerned, and with, on their own part, theories of happily sufficient fluidity to reinforce their abundant enthusiasms. The story of the first days is brilliantly told, and it is followed by a rapid and vivid description of the years of discussion and experiment—the invention and adjustment of social machinery, the gradual conquest of the neighbourhood, the many experiments undertaken, not merely in providing means of culture and recreation, but in co-operative enterprise, and later in general civic reconstruction. The narrative of schemes begun and developed, or attempted and abandoned, is interwoven with passages of personal reminiscence and confession, with stories of tragedy and heroism, drawn from a marvellously full store. At intervals, too, we learn of visits to Europe and contact with kindred workers on this side.

Miss Addams has some interesting comments to make on the changes in the intellectual and emotional aspects of England, at intervals of a few years before and during the South African War; and she tells of a visit to Tolstoy, which had a disconcerting effect upon her spiritual outlook. Beaten by the old prophet's questions as to her mode of life in the city, and caught by the idea of "bread labour," she resolved to pay toll, on her return to Chicago, by spending two hours every morning in the little bakery of Hull House—with this result:—

"It may be that I had thus to pacify my aroused conscience before I could settle down to hear Wagner's "Ring" at Bayreuth; it may be that I had fallen a victim to the phrase "bread labour"; but at any rate I held fast to the belief that I should do this, throughout the entire journey homeward, on land and sea, until I actually arrived in Chicago, when suddenly the whole scheme seemed to me as utterly preposterous, as it undoubtedly was. The half-dozen people invariably waiting to see me after breakfast, the piles of letters to be opened and answered, the demand of actual and pressing human wants,—were these all to be pushed aside and asked to wait while I saved my soul by two hours' work at baking bread?"

It would need many pages of quotation to give any adequate impression of a book which breathes on every page the spirit of the dedicated life. No one who would know the best of the religion of service, which is the highest ethical product of our age, can afford to miss the reading.

S.K.R.

## THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

"THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE," By EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES, Ph.D. London: Constable and Co., 10s. 6d. net.

THE great vogue of functional psychology in America has led to its use in the solution of many problems not strictly psychological. But in Sociology this process may well be a source of error. Society is something more than an aggregate of individuals, and the laws of social progress can no more be deduced from the study of the individual mind than from the study of the individual body. Biology and Psychology are basic to Sociology, which is conditioned by the physical environment and the nature of men. But Social Science is no more a mere extension or department of Biology and Psychology than Biology is a mere extension or department of Physics. The new elements of the social heritage and the social consensus make it necessary to treat Sociology as a separate science. If, then, Dr. Ames were to treat a social phenomena like religion as purely psychological, he would be pursuing a dangerous course. It happens, however, that a large part of his book is concerned with questions that may properly be treated as psychological—as preliminary to an investigation of religious development. Theories of the "origin" of religion, owing to the necessary failure of the historic record where primitive man is concerned, must necessarily rest on a study of the psychology of races in a low state of civilisation. So, too, for such phenomena as adolescence and conversion. On the latter subject Dr. Ames has a chapter of the greatest interest and lucidity.

The weakness of the psychological method shows itself when he attempts to appraise Lutheranism and Calvinism not as stages in the modern transition, not as results of the intellectual and material development of Western civilisation as a whole and of the particular countries in which these religions were accepted, but as psychological expressions of Luther and Calvin, the Lutherans and the Calvinists. This lands us in some curious positions. Calvinism, we are told, won those in whom there was a strong sense of solidarity. Is that why the turbulent and independent nobility of France rallied to it in such numbers? The Puritans, because of their cleanliness, suffered less from plague than others. Is that why the Puritan city of London was so often attacked? It would certainly be well, to have some further evidence both of Puritan cleanliness and Puritan immunity. Nor are the particular psychologic theories to which Dr. Ames holds without their dangers. To suggest that scientific research is motived and occasioned by practical interests is—if it be intended as a general proposition—to neglect one important element, the continuous progress of science in the modern world and the existence of a body of men of science. The sciences must develop in due order; each at any moment will have its growing points; and there, at the "next step," will scientific interest tend to concentrate. This is not to affirm that practical needs do not urge men of science in particular directions and hold them back from others; but in the modern world the over-ruling element of scientific advance in each age has been the progress made in the preceding age, itself dependent in turn on what had been done before.

There is another point of method which, if it be an error, is hardly an error for which Dr. Ames can be specially blamed, so general is it



among Sociologists. Here, indeed, his theory is excellent. Of the mental type which science creates, he writes:—

"At the same time it maintains a sensitive and delicate regard for the results which have been reached by previous conscientious investigation. The restatements of science are usually revolutionary only with reference to prescientific attitudes, as where chemistry supersedes alchemy or astronomy supplants astrology. But within the scientific period of a given area of knowledge, change is of the nature of enlargement, of new perspective and additional material and methods. The sense of continuity is strong, and the acknowledgment of previous achievement is frank and generous."

But it must be admitted that his practice does not conform to his theory. While all other sciences have grown up by each generation building on what has been done by its predecessors, every Sociologist of the present age strives to reconstruct anew, without troubling to use or even to examine what has already been done. Hence, instead of adaptation and continuous progress, there is nothing but chaos and confusion. To take one instance: Dr. Ames is in practical agreement with Vico that primitive man makes no distinction between an object and its spirit, and he quotes the words of a traveller: "The rice itself is addressed as though it were an animated being." Compare this with Vico in his *Nuova Scienza*:—

"The first men gave to the objects of their admiration an existence analogous to their own. That is precisely what children do, when they take in their play inanimate things and speak to them as to living persons."

And though in one or two places Vico gives what Dr. Ames would consider a too intellectual expression to his theory, he did not fail to rebuke those who treated primitive men as though they were philosophers. Far from being too intellectualistic, he considered that "certitude must be drawn from common sense applied to human needs and uses." It is satisfactory to find that in some respects Chicago in the twentieth century has arrived at the point reached by Naples in the early eighteenth.

Another case in which Dr. Ames has failed to carry out his excellent precept, is even more important. "Democracy and science," he says, "are thus remaking the whole social order," and by democracy he does not mean a form of government, nor the whole people as distinguished from the privileged classes, but something much wider, "sympathy and the sense of vast human order in which the individual is an active, organising factor, as well as a recipient of great influences," something in fact vaguely approaching Comte's conception of Humanity. But though Comte linked Humanity and Science as the foundations of the new order, there is no reference here to Comte. Again, Dr. Ames writes:—

In general it may be said that the ideality and the differentiation of the spirit or god reflects the degree of social development attained. In psychological terms it represents the result of generalisation and abstraction.

This passage follows closely Comte's account of the passage from Fetishism to Polytheism. Or, to turn to another French Sociologist,

Dr Ames accepts the relation between industry and mentality, the hunting, the pastoral, the military, the trading, and the manufacturing types of mental life, but the reference is to John Dewey, not to Frederic Le Play. But though it is unfortunate that Dr. Ames has thus failed to make his work continuous with that of his forerunners, he has enforced many valuable sociological truths, not least that of the growing social consensus. "The religious consciousness," to him, "is just the consciousness of the great interests and purposes of life in their most idealised and intensified forms."

"The social consciousness remains the constant, enveloping reality of human experience. Without it individualism becomes anarchy. By means of it the individual is identified with the great movements of history and is able to transcend the momentary and illusive interests of the sensuous and material phases of life. In the organised efforts of his group primitive man felt himself in league with vast powers. The widening scope and increasing control of conscious co-operative social enterprises has only enhanced that consciousness of the magnitude and marvellous character of the forces with which the individual is allied. If the sense of participation in the tribal wars of desert nomads, or the right to share in the harvest of the little land of Palestine could arouse the religious sentiments of gratitude and awe, how much deeper and richer may the religious consciousness which holds in imagination the immense universe of modern science and possesses the key to so many secrets of welfare and progress."

The book is one to be studied by all students of religious development.  
S. H. SWINNY.

#### A THEORY OF THE JEWS.

"THE JEWS: A STUDY OF RACE AND ENVIRONMENT." By MAURICE FISHBERG.  
Walter Scott, 1910. 6/-.

DR. FISHBERG has a scientific theory that sustains him through some 600 pages and a whirl of statistics. His theory is that there is no such thing as a Jewish race or a Jewish people. Apply any test you like, he says, and the Jew is revealed as what Sir Thomas Browne would call a vulgar error. Anthropology discovers not one but several Jewish types. There are blonde Jews and brunette Jews, dolichocephalic and brachycephalic. Eye colour, hair colour, skull shape—in all these there is nothing distinctively Jewish. Even the "Semitic" nose is not a tribal possession; a small minority of 15 per cent. of Jews can claim it. Nor is that all. Statistics show that the proportion of fair or dark, long or short-headed Jews varies directly with the environment. Among blonde neighbours there are more blonde Jews; among brunette neighbours more brunettes; so with crania. Somatically, says Dr. Fishberg, Jews are all things to all men; and from that he concludes that in every country the Jew as we see him is the product of intermarriage, without racial purity or racial distinctness. Under the searchlight of anthropology, the Jewish type fades away to an expression of the eyes, as the Cheshire cat faded away to a smile. But even this one ewe-lamb is not the Jew's exclusive possession or the heritage of his blood. It is just the badge of affliction: every harried and oppressed race shares it; and the Jew loses it as soon as he enters upon the flesh-pots of Egypt. Pathology tells the

same story. If the Jew in this country or that has a greater or less immunity from this or that disease, it is his way of life which explains the difference. Everywhere and in everything he is simply the creature of environment.

One may pause at this stage to examine, not Dr. Fishberg's facts—though even these are often much more open to question than he would admit—but some of the conclusions he draws from them. If, for instance, there are more blonde Jews in a country where the non-Jewish population is predominantly blonde, and *vice versa*, is the explanation intermarriage? Dr. Fishberg makes some play with the statistics from England; but these ought to have given him warning. We know in point of fact that in England intermarriage is, and still more has been, very scarce; we know further that in most cases the offspring of such intermarriage has been lost to the Jewish people; and we can, in probably every instance, say whether in an individual Jew in this country there is any English blood. Under such circumstances to attribute the relatively high percentage of fair-haired Jews in England to intermarriage is absurd. The same argument applies—not perhaps with the same force, because the residence of Jews in this country is comparatively brief—to the Jews of other countries. Certainly for centuries the intermarriage of Jews has meant a loss to the Jewish people rather than a mixing of the Jewish stock. The true explanation of variations among Jews from country to country is much more likely to be climate than intermarriage; and the recent anthropological researches in the United States certainly do not bear out Dr. Fishberg's view that a change of climate may not induce very considerable somatic change. All this apart, Dr. Fishberg never inquires whether, vary as they may within limits from country to country, the Jews do not in every country represent a different racial type from that of the people among whom they live.

Much of what Dr. Fishberg says is disputable, but even more curious are his omissions. The mentality of a people, the operation of a long-continued and peculiar system of education, the possession of a common historical tradition, may set a people apart as much as physical peculiarities; but all these things receive the most inadequate treatment or none at all from Dr. Fishberg. He says offhand that Jews are just like the rest of the world spiritually and intellectually, except for a few trifling accidents which can be negated. The bearing of all this is developed in his penultimate chapter, where Dr. Fishberg discusses Zionism and assimilation. Jews are, he says, moving rapidly towards complete assimilation, with the abolition of the accidental barriers created by the last two thousand years of history; and the "renationalisation" of the Jews is as impossible as it is undesirable. We can imagine some philosophers thinking that accidents two thousand years old might be obstinate and enduring, but Dr. Fishberg is suffering from a more serious confusion. One might admit that many, even the majority, if he prefers the overwhelming majority, of present-day Jews, are ripe for intermarriage and complete assimilation, but that would not mean that the Jews are destined to disappear soon or late into the chaos around them. The Jews who wish to assimilate determine their own fate, but not the fate of those who do not wish to assimilate; and the only Jews who count for the future of the Jewish people are the Jews who do not wish to assimilate. The question whether a people is to continue is not determined by cataloguing names or counting heads. It depends upon whether there is anywhere in that people the will to

live. In the past history of the Jews there have been at many periods myriads of Dr. Fishbergs. They cannot be traced now, but the Jewish people remains. If there are to-day seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal, and seven million that have, it is the seven thousand that matter when we are casting the horoscope, not of individuals, but of Judaism and the Jewish nation.

H. SACHS.

#### PERUVIAN CIVILIZATION.

"THE INCAS OF PERU," by SIR CLEMENTS MARKHAM, K.C.B., Smith, Elder & Co., 10s. 6d. net.

NEARLY four centuries have passed since Pedro Cieza de Leon, as a boy of fourteen, left Spain to begin his career as a soldier in South America, whose destiny it was in his later years to take "the first and most honourable place" in preserving to us the memory of that great Peruvian civilisation which the Spaniards were destroying. He was followed by many others, some sympathetic, others much the reverse, till sixty years ago another boy of fourteen, a young naval cadet on board H.M.S. Collingwood entered Callao roads, and soon began that study of the kingdom of the Incas which was to be an abiding interest to him throughout his long life. The latest work of Sir Clements Markham has no pretension to be a complete history. He assumes in his readers some acquaintance with the general characteristics of the Incanal system and with the course of events as told by Robertson or Prescott. He confines himself to the results of later research, the discussion of unsolved problems, and the consideration of some crucial points. He also gives a translation of the drama, "Ollantay." This, long handed down orally, was committed to writing in 1770, and a copy was found by Markham in the possession of a priest in a remote village of Peru—a priest who claimed to be descended from the Emperor Justinian, through the Justiniani of Genoa, and also from the ancient sovereigns of the country, through the grand-daughter of the last great Inca, Huayna Ceapac.

To the sociologist, the civilisation of the Incas is of great interest. Sociology does not admit of experiment as a means of investigation. We cannot alter social conditions merely to see what comes of the change. Even in legislation we cannot use the body politic as a *corpus vile*, giving one province bad laws and another good ones to note the contrast. And if we did so, generations might pass before the full results of the experiment could be obtained. But, as Pierre Laffitte has pointed out, a nation growing up apart from the main current of history under given conditions will supply the want of experiment. Though we cannot arrange the conditions, as in a true experiment, we may yet by choosing suitable cases, find valuable confirmation or modification of the results obtained by a survey of the general course of history. Now the Peruvians are an extreme case of isolation. Not only were they cut off from Europe, but they seem to have been ignorant of the picture-writing of Mexico. Yet, of themselves, they had produced a highly developed and complicated civilisation. There are good reasons for believing that it had developed very slowly, as might be expected where the only external stimulus was supplied by contact with similar but inferior groups and their gradual conquest.

In great river valleys, such as those of the Nile and the Ganges, the civilisation became theocratic; there was a great development of industry

and a more or less rigid system of caste, under the presidency of the priests. In Mesopotamia, the development had not gone so far. The worship of the Sun and the other heavenly bodies was the dominant form, with traces of more primitive animism or nature-worship. To the North, Assyria, from the neighbourhood of fierce mountain tribes, retained a more military character. Though the ruling family might claim divine descent, caste for the mass of the people hardly existed. Now the physical conditions of Peru were much more like those of Assyria than those of Egypt. It is, therefore, interesting to find a religion in which there prevailed the worship of the Sun, the ancestor of the Incas, in which there were no other castes, save in an exceptional case, and which was warlike and conquering. It is also of interest to note that the method of transferring a conquered people from their original home to another part of the Empire—so familiar to us from the story of the Captivity—was constantly employed by the Incas. Perhaps a close comparison between Assyria and Peru might yield other instances of similarity. But the history of the Incas affords also some warnings against a disposition to press too far the correlation of social institutions. Their civilisation was extraordinarily harmonious, their Empire was vast, their government was carried on by fixed principles. Yet they were ignorant of the alphabet and writing, and had to rely on a complicated system of cords and knots which could be at best an aid to memory or a means of reckoning.

The civilisation of Peru has been treated by some as an example of happy Socialism, by others as a grinding tyranny. It certainly allowed little free choice. The agents of the government went everywhere, and for the mass of the people appointed to each his work in life. But the despotism of the Incas was benevolent. It produced a very delicately balanced and very harmonious state of society and a high standard of morals. Even the Spaniards in destroying it, could not refrain from admiring. The last survivor of the original conquerors thus describes in his will the state of the Indians before the conquest:—

"They were so free from the committal of crimes and excesses, as well men as women, that the Indian who had 100,000 *pesos* of gold and silver in his house, left it open, merely placing a small stick across the door, as a sign that its master was out. With that, according to their custom, no one could enter or take anything that was there. When they saw that we put locks and keys on our doors, they supposed that it was from fear of them, that they might not kill us, but not because they believed that any one would steal the property of another. So that when they found that we had thieves amongst us, and men who sought to make their daughters commit sin, they despised us. But now they have come to such a pass, in offence of God, owing to the bad example that we have set them in all things that these natives from doing no evil, have changed into people who now do no good or very little."

Such were among the results of the victories of Imperial Spain.

S. H. SWINNY.

---

"TOWN STUDY," by M. M. PENSTONE. Westminster: The National Society, 1910.

THE inspiration of this excellent little work evidently comes from Prof. Geddes' address to the Sociological Society, "Civics as Applied Sociology."



Miss Penstone describes it as a volume of "suggestions for a course of lessons preliminary to the study of civics." It is written by an experienced and successful school teacher for the use of teachers; and it is admirably qualified to help teachers to vitalise the study of history and geography, and to arouse in children that intelligent interest in the social life of the communities to which they happen to belong, which is the indispensable preparation for good citizenship.

The first part of the book consists of a plea for a place in the school programme for Town Study beside Nature Study, and an examination of the methods to be recommended to the teacher. Miss Penstone holds that Town Study should come in two separate stages in the school career. History should begin, she thinks, for little children, as stories; then, for children of ten or twelve, there should be a stage in which the child's immediate neighbourhood is the subject of study. At this point the lessons should be somewhat of the nature of object lessons. The children should be told to notice a certain object or building during the week, and their observations, with any facts they have discovered, should be gathered together in the lesson, when also maps, pictures, and photographs should be produced. After this there should come a general history course, and later, when the power of abstract thought is developing, local history should be used illustratively.

The remaining, and much the larger, portion of the book is a sort of syllabus of the course of study suggested for this later stage. Miss Penstone recommends that the teacher should begin with the geographical, political, or social facts which cause towns to be placed where they are, and then study one aspect after another of the town's institutional and social life; its history during the middle ages, the local castle or monastery, if such there be, the parish church, the market and shops; the roads, railways, and waterways; the various municipal and other local services; the banks, offices, and newspapers. This part of the book is pemmican, concentrated information, which is yet well adapted to serve as a sort of skeleton outline, on which the teacher who zealously studies his own locality can construct a very fine course of instruction, to cover, say, two years of school life, at the rate of one lesson a week.

A very hearty welcome should await this book. Citizenship must begin with the power of understanding and loving some definite centre of social life, whether it be a city, factory town, market town, village or hamlet. Miss Penstone puts the teacher on the road towards instilling this understanding and love. She prompts him to see, and to make children see, the local community as a unit and a whole, with a life of its own, which is yet an inseparable part of the life of the nation. "We must educate our masters"—the precept is not carried out till their education has made them fit to be masters.

G.S.

---

"SOCIOLOGY AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS," by CHARLES A. ELLWOOD,  
Ph.D., American Book Company.

It would appear that every American university has its Professor of Sociology, and that each professor feels it to be his duty to publish an elementary text-book of his subject. In both these respects America differs from Great Britain. And yet if Sociology be in so advanced a stage that it is possible to express the gist of its teaching in a little book, such a little book should be as valuable to the British reader as

to the American. Unfortunately, however, the American text-books are not well adapted to meet the wants of British readers. Dr. Ellwood's little volume is no exception. The plan of it is stated as follows:—"In Chapters I. to VIII. the elementary principles of Sociology are stated and illustrated, chiefly through the origin, development, structure and functions of the family considered as a typical human institution; while in Chapters IX. to XV. certain special problems are considered in the light of these general principles." Here the words "considered as a typical human institution," are to be taken, presumably, in a Pickwickian sense; Dr. Ellwood cannot mean that religions, states, laws, trade unions, and other "human institutions" in infinite variety, can all be classed together and understood by reference to the typical member of the class, "the family." Evidently his treatment is based on the feeling, not that the family is the typical, but that it is the only very important human institution, a feeling perfectly natural in an American, seeing that American Society has been built up out of human fragments from older European Societies, and that the one social institution these fragments have been able immediately and with certainty to reconstruct, has been the family. But the sudden leap from the discussion, along the lines of Westermarck and Crawley, of the primitive human family, to that of important social problems of to-day, is disconcerting to an Englishman aware of the existence of a continuous process of social evolution during some thousands of generations.

Apart, however, from this fundamental drawback, Dr. Ellwood's little book may be commended as containing a judicially-written summary of the controversy on the origin of the family, and a discussion of the problems of immigration, the negro population, crime, pauperism, and the special deteriorating influences of city life, marked by the three great merits of brevity, lucidity, and common-sense.

G.S.

---

"MISERY AND ITS CAUSES." By EDWARD T. DEVINE. (American Social Progress Series.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909.

The author of this book is the General Secretary of the Charity Organisation Society of the City of New York. It is impossible, when reading it, not to wish that a joint conference between the British and American sections of the C.O.S. could be arranged. The difference in standpoint, if this book adequately represents the attitude of the American Society, is most marked. Dr. Devine says (p. 11): "In contrast with the idea that misery is moral, the inexorable visitation of punishment for immoral actions and the inevitable outcome of depraved character, I wish to present the idea that it is economic, the result of maladjustment, that defective personality is only a half-way explanation, which itself results directly from conditions which society may largely control." And this general statement he proceeds to amplify, prove and illustrate in three chapters entitled "Out of Health," "Out of Work," "Out of Friends," showing in his treatment a combination of qualifications for his subject which are in this country at least somewhat unusual. For Dr. Devine is, on the one hand, a trained economist and statistician; he is now Schiff Professor of Social Economy in Columbia University. On the other hand, he possesses the detached knowledge of particular cases of poverty which can only be gained by the personal practice of charity

and the conscientious keeping of exhaustive records. In his treatment, for instance, of preventable ill-health as one of the maladjustments to which poverty is due, he alternates between an admirable presentment of the statistics of the subject and a detailed account of four or five typical families. Nearly six pages are given to a description of one unfortunate Italian family, showing, as he puts it, "a record of overcrowding, of improper home work in a tenement, of seasonal work in factories, of lack of proper training for children, and of inadequate relief." This sad little story of Fanny, Joseph, Tony, and their mother is far better calculated to arouse the interest of the ordinary person in social reform than are statistics and more abstract sociological discussions.

The section headed "Out of Work" is not so satisfactory as that dealing with ill-health. The book was doubtless written before the publication of Mr. Beveridge's "Unemployment," and after the definite and incisive discussions of the question in that volume, Dr. Devine's treatment strikes one as vague. It is not possible, for instance, to discover from his short paragraph dealing with the subject whether casual labour is as great an evil in New York as it is with us. But his first conclusions are strikingly similar to those of English investigators (p. 146): "We shall find a real need for at least three things: a compulsory colony for vagrants; a voluntary colony for those who need and are willing to accept instruction and discipline without compulsion; and an employment exchange, or work market, with distinct departments for the several kinds of labour." Similarly Dr. Devine is unhesitatingly in favour (p. 130) of "compensation for accidents and for occupational diseases and retiring pensions in old age."

Space will not permit me to speak of the very interesting section describing an investigation into the circumstances of 5,000 families who came under the care of the Charity Organisation Society in the two years ending September 30th, 1908, but those who still believe that destitution is generally due to personal defects of character might well be referred to the summary of the disabilities affecting these families given on p. 204, from which, for example, it appears that unemployment was present in 69.16 per cent. of the families, widowhood in 29.44 per cent., intemperance only in 16.66 per cent., a criminal record in 3.02 per cent., and a violent or irritable temper in 2.8 per cent. In short, this interesting book shows a very clear appreciation of the ways in which present social conditions adversely affect human life, and is the more valuable as coming from a member of an organisation which tends, in this country at all events, to regard personal character as a far more important factor in the causation of poverty than social maladjustment.

MABEL ATKINSON.

---

"Die Stetigkeit im Kulturwandel; Eine Soziologische Studie." Von Alfred Vierkandt. Leipzig: Deeknur and Humblot, 1908. Pp. 209. 5 Marks.

This work is described by its author as a preliminary sketch for a discussion of the problem of the development of culture. In his view the materials are not yet available for a thorough treatment. He has also aimed at shewing by his handling of a concrete problem how sociology may be built up on a broad empirical basis as a special science after the pattern of the systematic disciplines. From both these points of view these two hundred pages are full of interest. The author sees that sociology must be based upon history and upon psychology, and accordingly the work

consists of three parts, historical, psychological, and sociological. He sees also that no one man can hope to do original work in all three departments and that division of labour and organised cooperation are essential for the progress of sociology. His plan of campaign is that the sociologist shall project rough schemes of generalisation of the facts of history, and shall hand them over to the historian for testing and verification, and shall receive them back for emendation in the light of the historian's criticisms; the process to be repeated indefinitely. The psychological section on "the historical structure of consciousness" displays a lack of well defined fundamental notions, *e.g.*, the author recognises the fundamental importance of the operation in the human mind of a number of instinctive tendencies; yet, like most other sociologists, he seems content with very loose and vague notions as to the nature and number of the human instincts, and frequently uses the language of psychological hedonism. Nevertheless his psychology is in other respects sound and serves him well in the sociological section. Everywhere he insists upon the continuity of change, the smallness of the steps, the long course of preparation that precedes considerable cultural changes, the overwhelming influence of the non-rational factors, the importance of the seemingly trivial and the genesis of the large effects and processes from a wealth of minute factors. Altogether, a vigorous, helpful, and promising attempt to bring some order and system into the science of culture. W. McD.

---

"The Home University Library of Modern Knowledge." Williams and Norgate. 1/- net, each volume.

One of the happiest ideas in recent publishing is embodied in the Home University Library, which is under the joint direction of three distinguished editors—Mr. Herbert Fisher, Professor Gilbert Murray, and Professor J. Arthur Thomson. The first batch of ten volumes has been published this month, and other batches are to follow at short intervals. Four have been sent to us for notice:—"Parliament: its History, Constitution, and Practice," by the highest of living authorities on the subject, Sir Courtenay Ilbert; "A Short History of Peace and War," by G. H. Perris; "The Stock Exchange," by Francis W. Hirst, Editor of the *Economist*; and "The Socialist Movement," by J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P. The form is pleasant, and the little books are excellently printed. A cursory examination of their contents leads us to make only one adverse criticism at the present stage, and that has reference to the bibliographies at the end of each volume. They are not all equally good. That given in Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's monograph is noticeably defective, and is marked by carelessness in the proper names. The list of Sociologist societies also is imperfect, and no Socialist journals are mentioned. Such small faults as these, however, are easily remediable in the later editions, which will certainly be called for.

---

"Stocks and the Stock Market"; "Banking Problems." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Nos. 118 and 121. London: P. S. King & Son.

Both these volumes of the American Annals contain a large amount of useful matter, in the form, as usual, of papers by a number of specialist writers. The first is provided with an extensive bibliography on securities and stock exchanges. It has been compiled by Dr. Huebner, of the University of Pennsylvania.

## PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

## FRENCH AND GERMAN.

The outstanding fact which impresses the reader as he glances through the encyclopædic pages of the *BULLETIN* of the Solvay Institute for the last few months, is the remarkable deepening and extension of psychological studies that is going on everywhere to-day, but more particularly in France and America. Thus the English reader will learn, from the December issue, that in the United States psychology is now popular both inside and outside the universities; and that as an applied science it is being employed in almost every branch of social activity, including politics and medicine. He will learn further from this number, of a society for the mathematical determination of psycho- and socio-biological facts, and of a public laboratory for comparative biology and psychology that have just been started in Paris; and of how Dr. Duprat is now conducting extra-university lectures on the theory of divine government, character studies based on psycho-pathology and a psychological curriculum at a military school. The November issue contains a most convenient annotated bibliography of psychology by that indefatigable student and writer, M. Menzerath, an account of the school of experimental research which he is carrying on, under Dr. Ley, at the *Fort Jaco* Sanatorium in Belgium; and a note relative to the establishment of an association for the study of the religious temperament at Nuremburg. In the January number M. Menzerath gives us another bibliography. The editors propose to make epitomes of the like nature a constant feature of the *Bulletin*. Should this intention be carried out, anyone who wishes to make a comprehensive study of any branch of psychology will find this publication not merely valuable, but indispensable.

In *LA SCIENCE SOCIALE* for December one may read, in a quotation from Henri de Tourville, that after half a century of manly activity employed in making capital out of the most varied environments, the Englishman is still young and ready for new enterprises. Since the late Edmond Demolins is the genius of this periodical, no surprise or scepticism will be occasioned by this flattering Anglophil citation, which occurs in the course of a treatise on different types of family life that constitutes not only the December, but also the February number. The writer is M. Philippe Champault, who studies the family as an organisation having two functions, viz., the production and the education of citizens. According to the various ways in which they fulfil these functions, he distinguishes between communal, semi-particularist, and particularist families, using success in colonization as the test of the virility which gives a man or a group the right to be described as purely particularist. He complains that demographers have not sufficiently demonstrated how the constitution of the family, whether it be socialist or individualist, determines the birth-rate; and sheds a good deal of light on the declining natality of the French nation by showing how it is the outcome of the communal ties that subsist between relatives in France and give rise to what Buckle called "the protectionist spirit." This monograph is too uncritical, however, to be of very high sociological value. Admiration of the English people is evidently a prejudice with the author, and so is anthropomorphism; for he writes as if human desires and needs were met the most efficiently by natural as distinguished from artificial means, and yet as if the high English birth-rate were a conscious, reasoned result of a national independence of character.



The January number of the same Review is a still better embodiment of the spirit of the founder of *L'Ecole des Roches*, for it consists in a history of school education in England by M. Paul Descamps. It is plain and pleasant, but so much more appreciative than critical as to be almost tame. The trend of English education, the writer observes, is the training of character by making the child bear responsibility.

The *Memoirs of LE MUSÉE SOCIAL* for January and February have a special interest for students of the Poor Law. The February issue is an account of the organisation of private charities that has been carried on in Paris, with a few breaks due to political disturbances, since 1651. The system was reconstituted on modern lines in 1900, and now the voluntary charitable societies of almost every ward in the city send a delegate to the monthly meetings of a local centralizing committee that serves as an information bureau, and resembles, in certain particulars, both our Charity Organisation Society and the newly-founded London Association of Public Welfare. The January treatise consists of a study of poverty at Naples. The most remarkable of the facts mentioned are: that Naples has 1,201 doctors and 2,339 lawyers, while Rome has only 832 of the former and 1,473 of the latter; that while at Genoa industrial undertakings employ the power of one horse for every 26 inhabitants, the proportion at Naples is only one for 87; that between 1872 and 1901 the population increased by 118,000, whereas the consumption of commodities decreased by 5.18%; that the birth-rate is higher than that of any other large town in Italy; that the taxation is relatively high; and that while in the country at large the amount expended on lottery speculations is 2fr. 80 per head, at Naples it is no less than 15fr. 75. The Government has succeeded in stemming the tide of pauperism by a law passed in 1904 establishing an industrial area within which taxation and octroi duties are remitted in some cases and reduced in others. Thus factories have been opened and technical schools founded; but Neapolitan laziness, we are told, will be an unsolved problem for many a year to come.

The *ZENTRALEBLATT FÜR ANTHROPOLOGIE* can hardly be reviewed because it is itself a collection of reviews, but it is so comprehensive, and is so carefully edited and well printed that a grateful acknowledgment of its usefulness to the anthropologist seems necessary. This periodical, which appears once every two months, marks a high level of anthropological achievement in Germany: and we learn from the first review of the last issue for 1910, that fresh facilities for the study are being provided by the university authorities. For instance, the Anatomic Institute at Freiburg, recently rebuilt, has been provided with a museum for students of the subject, two well-equipped laboratories, a room for taking the measurements of living persons and a study for the director.

Is mental disease on the increase, and what is the cultural matrix out of which it arises? These questions are put by two writers in the November-December issue of the *ARCHIV FÜR RASSEN- U. GESELLSCHAFTS-BIOLOGIE*. The answers are printed here from papers that were read at the International Congress for the study of Insanity which took place at Berlin in October last. In the first Prof. Dr. L. W. Weber shows that although lunatic asylums have increased enormously, in Europe, from 1875 to the present time, it cannot be proved that insanity has increased. His explanation of the extension of asylum accommodation is, that higher standards of living both inside and outside the institutions constantly drive a larger and larger proportion of the insane out of the family into the specialized surroundings designed for them. In the countries in which this movement has proceeded the farthest, the insane add up to between four and five per thousand of the population, and three or four out of the four or five are confined in asylums. At this point the number of both patients and asylums remains stationary; and a hopeful feature of

the institutional life is that within the last few years the proportion of the young people who are admitted to a share in it has become smaller and smaller. The figures by which the Professor substantiates these reassuring conclusions are worth careful study.

If the first paper is all hope with many figures, the second, by Dr. Ernst Rüdin, is all gloom with no figures. The good doctor seems to be quite sorry that there are no famines, black deaths and savage wars to weed out the weak nowadays; and believes that the excitements of modern life are ruining the nervous constitution of the people. He discovers no counteractive disciplines at work in society; and yet, strangely enough, he remarks the recent growth of social solidarity and of the sense of responsibility in both public and private life.

---

The interest of the *VIERTELJAHRSSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE PHILOSOPHIE UND SOZIOLOGIE* for December is mainly metaphysical and epistemological. The articles that sociologists may most like to read are: *Ueber ästhetische Grundtypen*, by Kasimir Filip Wize, and *Das Wesen der Wahrheit nach der modernen Logik*, by Moritz Schlick.

---

*Fragments de philosophie morale*, by M. F. Rauh, and *Vues sur les problèmes de la philosophie*, by M. Georges Sorel, are two criticisms of modern systems of thought which appear in the January number of the *REVUE DE MÉTAPHYSIQUE ET DE MORALE*, and which will greatly interest the sociologist. M. Rauh discovers no absolutism in morals. To the question whether they are shaped into unalterable forms by race or nationality, climate or government, class feelings or economic facts, he gives a negative answer. It is no longer principles, invented by priests and philosophers, that supply the sanctions of morality, but passing practical necessities, keenly felt by the proletariat and giving rise to "the solidarity of hunger." Even the Spencerian absolutes, the laws of nature, need not tyrannize over humanity in the realm of morality. Comte and Bergson have destroyed "the superstition of objectivity," and shown that to a large extent man is not bound to be mastered by facts, but can select and even make them. M. Sorel argues in the same strain. He demonstrates that not only religious and historical doctrines, but scientific theories like that of the conservation of energy, the unity of nature, and, above all, the evolution of living creatures, are largely subjective, and are modelled on our own everyday activities far more than we think. We do not sufficiently distinguish between "natural nature" and "artificial nature," and half our time it is only the latter with which we are acquainted.

---

A continuity of interest runs through the December, January, and February numbers of the *REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE* in that the lion's portion of the space, in each case, is devoted to the proceedings of the Paris Sociological Society, at successive meetings of which different phases of progress are being discussed. So far M. Grimanelli has discoursed on "Evolution and Progress," M. Yves Guyot on "The Characteristics of Progress," and M. Eugène-Nino Laval on "The Frailties of Progress." M. Grimanelli's disquisition is based on an extensive knowledge of Comte, which leads him to neglect the wave-like social changes that seem like evolutions and revolutions to those who are passing through them, and look for advance only in the changes that take place in large masses of humanity through considerable periods of time. He calls evolution continuity in variation, and distinguishes the evolutions that have social significance as (1) the psychic advance from theological to positive thinking, (2) the substitution of work for war as a civilizing force, (3) the extension of sociability from the family to the race. He reconciles the subjective conception of progress as an ascent from the less to the more desirable with the positivist doctrine, by showing how human

desires and sentiments are objective relatively to the human race, and are conditioned by realities that are positive and objective *par excellence*.

M. Guyot's outlook is economic: and he measures progress by the substitution of machine for hand industry, the predominance of objectivism over subjectivism in thought, the independence enjoyed by women, the displacing of distributive by commutative justice, and, in commerce and government, of authority by contract, the growth of the power to think of things apart from people, and the cessation of political in favour of industrial competition. He points out, with an appreciative reference to Buckle, that it is intellectual not moral progress which has improved the lot of humanity; and he manifests a simple faith in Spencerian individualism and the Manchester School which is anything but modern.

M. Laval's paper has much literary but little scientific value. He supposes that the delicate balance of forces represented by modern machinery, whether material or social, is necessarily precarious, and that whenever a breakdown occurs "the intensity of the accident is a function of the progress realised." Nevertheless he has a word of praise for the "chivalry of progress," and the high courage with which men are compelling the mightiest forces of nature to do the drudgery of civilisation.

The other articles are *Etudes d'énergétique sociale*, by Prof. Wilhelm Ostwald, *L'Electricité dans l'agriculture*, by M. Léon Martin, *Les conceptions mécaniques et organiques de l'Etat*, by M. L. Stein, and *La Société Allemande de Sociologie*, by Prof. Robert Michels. The last is a highly entertaining explanation of the backward condition of sociology in Germany, where the new scheme has not flourished, we are told, because the court folk do not like it, and because in professorial circles it was long feared that "the name concealed the most odious of dilettantisms."

#### ITALIAN.

REVISTA ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA. Anno XV. Fasc. 1. G. Sergi: Differenze nei costumi dei popoli e loro resistenza ad un rapido mutamento.

In spite of a tendency to assimilation in the customs of European nations, differences are apparent in their modes of living, their interpretation of morality and in their religious character, even where the dominant religion is Christianity. The particular customs of the people who form the Chinese Empire persist, in spite of external uniformity and conservation. The explanation of this resistance to change must be sought in the domain of psychology. If psychical inertia is a powerful factor in the individual, it is far more so in the collective life, where there is a multiplication of the force of resistance.

G. Salvio: Il monachismo occidentale e la sua storia economica. The history of the monastic orders has been treated apart from the exigencies of material life and the necessity of economic organization. A monastery under the Benedictine rule reproduced the conditions of the Roman "villa." Advantages of ecclesiastical landlordism. Monasteries in the Middle Ages the sole depositories of moveable wealth. When the monastery became a comfortable home for consumers, rather than a centre of productive activity, the result was inevitable exhaustion. The mendicant orders failed, because diametrically opposed to existing material needs. The economic organization of the Company of Jesus is representative of modern monasticism in the west; the Jesuits as men of their time recognized the increasing importance of capital wealth as contrasted with landed property. Moreover the single monastery is no longer autonomous, business is centralized, which facilitates financial operations of every kind.

R. Pettazoni: Ordalia Sarda e Ordalie Africane. The writer describes a form of ordeal by water formerly practised in Sardinia, in cases of supposed theft. The same custom is found at the present day on the Gold Coast, the identical form of ordeal

under identical circumstances. It is perhaps possible to find a connecting link in the ancient civilization of Northern Africa.

Note e Comunicazioni. R. A. Murray: *Le Scienze Sociali e il metodo sperimentale*. F. Chessa: *Le classe medie*.

RIVISTA INTERNAZIONALE DI SCIENZE SOCIALI E DISCIPLINE AUXILIARIE. Novembre 1910.

Pietro Pisani: *L'emigrazione italiana nell'America del nord e la sua importanza per l'avvenire d'Italia*. Physical and moral results of the unhealthy conditions of Italian life in New York, the city which absorbs one-third of our emigrants to North America. 25%—30% of their earnings go in house rent, while the extortions of boss and "banchista" still further decrease the worker's earnings. The writer strongly recommends the "contadino" to return to the land. Italians have not availed themselves of the great encouragement afforded recently to agriculture both in the States and Canada. From 1904—1907 75% of those who landed in New York were peasants or sons of peasants, of whom hardly a tenth became agriculturists. Ugo Guida: *I remedi del tirocinio industriale*: This article deals with forms of apprenticeship, technical instruction, the necessity of state regulation.

Dicembre 1910. P. Amelio Palmieri: *La Finlandia (Etuografia, Coltura Religioni)* Francesco Corridore: *Le relazioni economiche dell'Italia con gli Stati Balcanici*. An account of commercial relations with the Balkan States and the number of Italians resident there.

Giuseppe Menotti De Francesco: *Il problema della scuola primaria e popolare in Italia e il disegno di legge Daneo Credaro*. The writer severely criticizes a law, which deprives the Commune of its powers in the educational sphere, transferring them to a provincial Scholastic Council, which is no organ of the popular will, but rather a more or less direct emanation of the central power. It is hoped that the feeding of poor children and the granting of subsidies for clothes and boots will make it possible to enforce attendance, but the writer fears that the problem will not be solved, owing to the smallness of means at disposal; the authorities rely on the initiative of private persons and benevolent institutions.

Gennaio 1911. Francesco Corridore: *Le relazioni economiche dell'Italia con gli Stati Balcanici*. A continuation of the article in the December number. Dott. Mario Duret: *Il Cristianesimo e le relazioni internazionali*. An account of international relations in the ages of antiquity and among pre-Christian peoples. The maxims and principles of Christianity were opposed to the ferocity of the barbarian, to the harshness of custom and to hatred of the stranger. Cesare Rinaudo: *La lotta sindacale contro le sotto-concorrenze operaie*. An article on Gemüling's book "Travailleurs au rabais.—La lutte syndicale contre les sous-concurrences ouvrières." Theories of early economists. Unreality of freedom of contract between employers and employés. In modern industry, owing to increased division of labour and the breaking down of barriers between the different trades, men, women, and children will find themselves on the same plane, engaged in an unequal strife. Competition of child labour, attempts to limit number of apprentices and fix a minimum wage for them. Competition of female labour. Causes of the low scale of women's wages. Attitude of men's Trades Unions.

Febbraio 1911. Guio Faralli. "Chamberlain" e l'imperialismo economico di fronte al libero scambio nella Gran Bretagna. This article is introductory and deals with the triumph of free trade principles, and the effect of laissez faire doctrine on Colonial policy.

Paolo Cesare Rinaudo: "La lotta sindacale contro le sotto-concorrenze operaie." Methods adopted in different countries to protect home workers against the competition of the foreigner. Danger of a reduction of wages through employment of

disorganized home workers and possible remedies. Competition of provincial industries, in which the salaries are lower; the work done by occupants of penitentiaries and benevolent institutions must also be taken into account; it is suggested that these latter should combine to form a fixed tariff. The workers propose to protect themselves further by the exclusion from their special industry of all who have not fulfilled the regular apprenticeship.

Mario Duret: "Il cristianesimo e le relazioni internazionali." Mediæval Conceptions of Empire and papacy. Attitude of the Church Councils towards enmity and violence. Recent examples of papal arbitration. Question of the universality of the Christian peace principle.

#### ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY, Vol. xxvi, No. 1.—The current discussion of the Referendum gives interest to an article in this number on "People's Rule" in Oregon, by G. H. Haines. Observers at a distance, the writer says, might have supposed that in Oregon, with the securing of the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, not to speak of the direct primary and a genuinely popular election of senators, all the pressing problems of democracy had been solved. He goes on to give an instructive account of the working of the new institutions in recent contests. So far, he thinks, the results go to show that "people's rule" has strengthened its position.—In an article headed "Barriers against British Democracy," Mr. Edward Porritt discusses plural voting, university representation, non-payment of members, and the throwing of official expenses upon parliamentary candidates as, from the American standpoint, the most obvious anomalies of the British electoral system.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, Vol. xvi, No. 4.—The survey of housing conditions in Chicago is continued by Miss Breckinridge and Miss Edith Abbott, of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, the present instalment dealing with the dwellings "back of" the Stockyards. The descriptions and statistics and a number of striking illustrations reveal conditions of profound wretchedness.—G. E. Vincent, in "The Rivalry of Social Groups," examines some of the phenomena of group formation in contemporary society.—L. L. Bernard continues his study of the "Transition to an Objective Standard of Social Control," and Frances Fenton her inquiry into the influence of newspapers upon the growth of crime and other anti-social activity.

ECONOMIC JOURNAL, No. 81, Vol. xxi.—Sir Edward Brabrook has a short note on "State Invalidity Insurance," in which he urges that the supersession of the Friendly Societies by the State would mean the destruction of an organisation which has not failed in its purpose and of which the nation has been justly proud. He discusses the various ways in which the State might work in association with the societies, and the probable effects of competition.—Among the other articles are: J. C. Stamp—"Land Valuation and Rating Reform"; A. de Hollan—"Results of the Measures taken in Hungary for the Development of Industry."

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS, Vol. xxi, No. 2.—Under the heading of "The Place of Leisure in Life," Dr. Bosanquet gives a popular account of the unity, or what he calls the plot, of Aristotle's Ethics—the nature of the true aim of life, as contrasted with the methods of statesmanship. Three kindred ideas express for Aristotle attainment of the end of human life—Theoretical Wisdom, Leisure, Happiness. The main object of education is to teach the right use of leisure, and for Aristotle its object was the communication of disinterested interests. Nothing



to-day, perhaps, could be more practical or of higher social importance. Professor Thomas Jones, on Charity Organisation, states the opposite view to that held and frequently expounded by Dr. Bosanquet. Other articles: A. O. Lovejoy, "William James as Philosopher"; J. W. Scott, "Idealism and the Conception of Forgiveness."

AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW Vol. I, No. 1.—A cordial welcome is due to this, the latest comer into the already well-stocked field of American socio-economic Reviews. It is the organ of the American Economic Association, Cambridge, Mass. Mr. J. H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, is chairman of the editorial board, and the managing editor is Mr. Davis R. Dewey, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The contents of the first number are sufficiently varied to give the Review an appeal to many different classes of students. "Some Unsettled Problems of Irrigation," is the theme of Katherine Coman; F. W. Taussig criticises the U.S. Tariff Act of 1909 under the heading "How Tariffs should not be Made"; D. Kinley writes on the promotion of trade with South America, and H. A. Millis on East Indian Immigration to British Columbia and the Pacific States. The section devoted to book reviews is large and is carefully classified.

EUGENICS REVIEW, Vol. II, No. 4.—Dr. F. W. Mott has a paper on "Heredity and Insanity," with a number of valuable tables and very interesting diagrams. Dr. Murray Leslie discusses "Woman's Progress in Relation to Eugenics." His statement of the question is rather strongly antagonistic to the modern women's movement, but he sums up, on the whole, hopefully. Other articles: MacLeod Yearsley, "Eugenics and Deaf-mutism"; C. E. Woodruff, "The Eugenics of Migrants."

TOWN-PLANNING REVIEW Vol. I, No. 4.—Professor Adshead has a note on the King Edward VII. Memorial Schemes, with special reference to the proposals for the remodelling of the surroundings of St. George's Hall, Liverpool. Vienna as an example of town-planning is considered, with the aid of many admirable illustrations, by Mr. Abercrombie. Mr. Ramsey Muir and Prof. Adshead continue the discussion of the problem of Central Liverpool. There is a short paper by G. B. Ford giving an American view of housing reform.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS, Vol. xxv, No. 2.—R. H. Smith, "Distribution of Income in Great Britain, and Incidence of Income-tax"; Leo Wiener, "Economic History and Philology"; P. T. Cherington, "Some Aspects of the Wool Trade of the United States."

THE MONIST, Vol. xxi, No. 1.—W. M. Salter, "Schopenhauer's Type of Idealism"; J. E. Boodin, "From Protagoras to William James"; The Editor, "Professor Mach and his Work."

---

#### ALSO RECEIVED:

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: "The Need for Currency Reform"; "The Public Health Movement"; "Electric Railway Transportation."

"Scottish Geographical Magazine," "Man," "Highway," "Open Court," "Progress," "La Lectura Revistade Ciencias y de Artes."

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. (Trans. from the German by John Lees, with an Introduction by Lord Redesdale). "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. John Lane. 25/- net.
- L'Institut International de Sociologie. "La Solidarité Sociale dans le Temps et dans l'Espace": Tome XII. "Ses Formes, son Principe, ses Limites": Tome XIII. Giard et Brière. 7 francs each.
- Mills, J. Saxon. "England's Foundation: Agriculture and the State." P. S. King & Son. 1/- net.
- Small, W. Albion. "The Meaning of Social Science." University of Chicago Press. 6/- net.
- Black, Dr. Rudolf. "Englands Schatz durch den Aussenhandel" (Thomas Mun). F. Tempsky, Vienna, and G. Freytag, Leipzig.
- Brandes, George. "Ferdinand Lassalle." W. Heinemann. 6/- net.
- Fergusson, Rev. R. Menzies. "The Vagrant: What to do with him." James Nisbet & Co. 6d. net.
- Buchanan, J. Courtney. "The Function of the Voluntary Hospital in relation to the proposed Public Assistance Authority." 1/- net.
- Fife, Warner. "Individualism." Longmans. 6/6 net.
- Loria, Achille. (Trans. from the Italian by John Leslie Garner.) "Contemporary Social Problems." Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 2/6.
- Deploige, Simon. "Le Conflict de la Morale et de la Sociologie." Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, Louvain. 7.50 francs.
- Slaughter, Dr. J. W. (Introduction by J. J. Findlay). "Adolescence." Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 2/6 net.
- Macdonald, Greville, M.D. "The Child's Inheritance." Smith, Elder & Co. 12/6 net.
- Morris, John E., and Jordan, Humfrey. "Introduction to the Study of Local History and Antiquities." Routledge & Sons. 4/6 net.
- Macdonald, W. Allen, and Meredith, Ellen. "The New Order: Social Evolution by Free Groups." 3d. net.
- Sherlock, E. B., M.D. "The Feeble-Minded." Macmillan & Co. 8/6 net.
- Nearing, Scott. "Social Adjustment." Macmillan & Co. 6/6 net.
- Lewy, Emile. "Paix Sociale et Internationale." Giard et Brière. 1 franc.
- Schreiner, Olive. "Woman and Labour." Fisher Unwin. 8/6 net.
- Keynes, Margaret. "The Problem of Boy Labour in Cambridge." Bowes & Bowes. 3d. net.

- "The Cambridge Register of Social and Philanthropic Agencies." Bowes & Bowes. 3d. net.
- Instituts Solvay. J. Lewinski. "Etudes Sociales. L'Evolution Industrielle de la Belgique." Maurice Ansiaux. "Principes de la Politique Regulatrice des Changes." Misch et Thron.
- Slosse, A., and Waxweiler, E. "Recherches sur le Travail humain dans l'Industrie. I. Enquête sur le régime alimentaire de 1065 ouvriers belges." Fasc. 9. Misch et Thron. Travaux de l'Institut Solvay. Ernest Mahaim. Notes et Mémoires. Les Abonnements d'Ouvriers sur les Lignes de Chemins de fer belges et leurs effets sociaux. fasc. 11.
- Carus, Paul. "Truth on Trial." The Open Court Publishing Co. \$1.00.
- Hecker, Eugen A. "A Short History of Women's Rights." G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Doane, Prof. Rennie W. "Insects and Disease." Constable & Co. 8/- net.
- Toynbee, Gertrude. "Joseph and Arnold Toynbee." H. J. Glaisher. 1/6 net.
- Haddon, Kathleen. "Cat's Cradles from Many Lands." Longmans. 2/6 net.
- Bergson, Henri. (Trans. by Arthur Mitchell.) "Creative Evolution." Macmillan & Co. 10/- net.
- Hodson, T. C. "The Nāga Tribes of Manipur." Macmillan & Co. 8/6 net.
- Taylor, Henry Osborn. "The Mediæval Mind." 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 21/- net.
- Addams, Jane. "Twenty Years at Hull House." Macmillan & Co. 10/6 net.
- Frazer, J. G. "The Golden Bough." Part I. The Magic Art and the Evolution of Kings. 2 vols. Third Edition. Macmillan & Co. 20/- net.
- Belloc, Hilaire, and Chesterton, Cecil. "The Party System." Stephen Swift. 3/6 net.
- Greef, G. de. "Introduction à la Sociologie." 2 vols. Marcel Rivière & Cie. 12 francs.
- Dugdale, Robert L. (Introduction by Franklin H. Giddings). "The Jukes." G. P. Putman's Sons. 5/- net.
- Bernard, Luther Lee. "The Transition to an Objective Standard of Social Control." University of Chicago Press. 54 cents.
- Perris, G. H. "History of War and Peace." Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.
- Ilbert, Sir C. P. "Parliament." Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.
- MacDonald, J. Ramsay, M.P. "The Socialist Movement." Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.
- Hirst, F. W. "The Stock Exchange." Williams and Norgate. 1s. net.
- Kisch, H. J. "Religion of the Civilised World and Judaism." Geo. Routledge and Sons.

## THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

## REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR THE YEAR 1910.

A prolonged disturbance in the sphere of politics inevitably militates against the well-being of a learned society, more especially when, as in the case of the Sociological Society, its activities are related in greater or less degree to all the influences of social development and change. It is therefore not surprising that the Sociological Society should have been to some extent adversely affected by the severe political controversies of the past two years, and that the occurrence of two general elections in a twelvemonth,—both of them, as it happened, in the middle of the winter season—has added very considerably to the difficulties of arranging the programme of papers, and of obtaining adequate audiences for the ordinary meetings. Notwithstanding these circumstances, however, the Society has maintained its position, and has, in fact, received during the past few months a larger measure of public notice, especially in the way of press reports, than it has enjoyed since the first years of its existence. This is due, doubtless, partly to the fact that the papers have in the main dealt with subjects rather closely concerned with contemporary problems; but also, it may be said, to the growing recognition of the fact that the Society is rendering a valuable service in providing a platform upon which questions of high importance to civilised society may be discussed without reference to sectional or party interests.

## MEETINGS AND PAPERS.

During the year under report the full number of ordinary meetings for papers and discussions was held, and the migration of the Society for this purpose to the ample hall of the Royal Society of Arts, noted in last year's report, has had an appreciable effect upon the size of the audiences. It may be noted also that towards the end of the year, as the result of a vote taken among the members, the Council decided that about half the ordinary meetings should be held in the afternoons (5.15), with an opportunity for meeting at tea. There is reason to anticipate that the innovation will not only be generally appreciated, but will be especially welcome to a large section of the members who find evening lectures inconvenient, and, further, that it will be of material assistance in bringing together representative audiences. There is, more particularly among professional men and women and those engaged in the public service, a growing disinclination to attendance at after-dinner meetings. The following is the list of papers and lectures during the Lent term:—

February 8.—Dr. C. W. Saleeby: "The Methods of Eugenics"; the Rev. Dr. Caldecott in the chair. The paper was published in the *Sociological Review* for October, 1910.

February 22.—Mr. J. A. Hobson: "The General Election: a Sociological Interpretation"; Sir Edward Brabrook in the chair. (*Sociological Review*, April, 1910.)

March 8.—Annual General Meeting, followed by the Presidential Address from Mr. Frederic Harrison: "Sociology: its Definition and its Limits." (*Sociological Review*, April, 1910.)

April 12.—Mr. W. Rothenstein: "The Social Aspects of Art"; Mr. C. R. Ashbee in the chair.

April 26.—Sir Horace Plunkett: "The Sociological Aspects of the Agrarian Revolution in Ireland"; Mr. R. A. Yerburgh, M.P., in the chair. (*Sociological Review*, July, 1910.)

May 24.—Professor Hermann Levy (of Heidelberg): "English Rural Society: its Structure and Changes"; Mr. S. H. Swinny in the chair.

The papers and lectures during the autumn term were:—

October 18.—Professor Geddes: "The Lessons of the Town-planning Conference and Exhibition"; Mr. Raymond Unwin in the chair.

November 1.—Sir Theodore Morison, K.C.I.E.: "The Economic Structure of Indian Society"; Sir George Birdwood, K.C.I.E., in the chair.

November 15.—Mr. George Montagu: "The Highways of England: their Growth and Relation to Civics"; Professor A. J. Herbertson in the chair. (*Sociological Review*, January, 1911.)

November 29.—Professor M. E. Sadler: "The State and Education"; Mr. Graham Wallas in the chair. (*Sociological Review*, April, 1911.)

December 13.—Dr. J. Lionel Tayler: "Sociology and its Racial Application"; Dr. F. W. Mott, F.R.S., in the chair. (*Sociological Review*, January, 1911.)

#### THE HONORARY SECRETARY.

The Council announces, with the greatest possible regret, that Mr. V. V. Branford has found it necessary for a number of reasons to resign the post of Honorary Secretary which he has filled since the formation of the Society in 1903. In making this known to the members, the Council desires to place on record its sense of obligation to Mr. Branford for his continuous devotion to the cause of the Society since its inception, and for the invaluable services rendered by him in every department of the work undertaken during the past seven years. It was largely as the result of his energetic propaganda that the Sociological Society came into being, while the notable success of its early meetings was due in



no small measure to his admirable organisation. Upon Mr. Branford, moreover, fell the principal part of the work in connection with the editing of the three volumes of *Sociological Papers*, the publication of which did so much to make the Society known among students of the social sciences in every part of the world. The terms in which Mr. Branford's resignation was couched left the Council no option in the matter; but although for the present the late Honorary Secretary has no official connection with the society the Council notes with pleasure that there is no reason to anticipate his withdrawal from the sphere of work in which the society is engaged.

Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe has intimated his willingness to accept the honorary, in place of the paid, secretaryship of the Society.

#### MEMBERSHIP.

The Society closes the year with a roll of 335 ordinary, 36 life, and 22 honorary and corresponding members. This total, the Council would point out, is not nearly so large as it ought to be, in view of the wide range of the subject-matter of Sociology and the continually increasing number of students engaged in one or other department of the social sciences; and hopes are entertained that the continually increasing measure of public recognition accorded to the Society may lead to a greatly enlarged membership during the ensuing year.

#### SUMMARY OF BALANCE SHEET.

At the end of 1909 the accounts of the Society showed an adverse balance of £104 7s. 7d., a considerable proportion of which was due to arrears of subscription. The year just closed has been marked by a gratifying improvement in this respect, the deficiency on the year's working being £57 5s. 1d. The total deficit now amounts to £161 12s. 8d. While it is to be regretted that the Society is still not quite self-supporting, the Council entertains the hope that, partly as the result of the rearrangement in the matter of the Secretaryship, the income henceforward will be fully adequate to meet the demands of expenditure.

#### THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW.

In the July number of the *Sociological Review* it was announced that Professor L. T. Hobhouse, who had been editor of the journal from its foundation in 1907, found himself compelled by pressure of other work to relinquish the direction. The Council in accepting with great reluctance Professor Hobhouse's resignation, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing the great indebtedness of the Society to its distinguished editor for his services. Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe was appointed acting editor.

The guarantee fund, with the aid of which the Review was founded after the discontinuance of the annual *Sociological Papers*,

was designed to cover a period of three years. This period came to an end in October, 1910, and it therefore became necessary for the Council, before embarking upon arrangements for the issue of a fourth volume, to ascertain whether the members of the Society were favourable to the continuance of the Review, and if so, what measure of financial support might be looked for. An appeal for additional guarantees, to cover a further term of two years, was circulated, and the response, though falling somewhat short of the amount necessary to meet the estimated liabilities, was, in the opinion of the Council, sufficient to justify continued publication. It is satisfactory to note that the number of small guarantees is very much larger than it was at the beginning; but it should not be forgotten that the maintenance of the Review would be impossible were it not for the continued generosity of a few large donors. The fund, accordingly, has not yet been closed, and contributions may still be sent in.

The letters received in reply to the appeal left no doubt of the agreement of members as to the necessity of maintaining the Review but the Council is disposed to think that students of Sociology in general are still far from realising the value of the Society's journal as a means of communication and discussion. Proposals are now under consideration for the development of the Review, more especially in the direction of special numbers to be published at reasonably frequent intervals.

#### THE CITIES COMMITTEE.

The Cities Committee under the direction of its convener, Professor Geddes, has had a year of exceptional activity. Interest in the subject of town survey and, as a valuable factor in education, of town study in relation to the problems of town development, has been much enhanced since the passing of the Housing and Town-planning Act, and the holding of a comprehensive Town-planning Exhibition, at the Royal Academy last October, acted as a great stimulus to the movement. The Royal Institute of British Architects, organisers of the Exhibition and of the accompanying International Congress, placed a room at the disposal of Professor Geddes for his outline Survey of Edinburgh, which many members of the Sociological Society were enabled to examine under his guidance. This exhibit, highly successful at Burlington House, was later removed to the re-erected Crosby Hall, at Chelsea, as part of a typical Cities Exhibition, including many of the most important exhibits of the October Exhibition and a number of other Surveys (of Salisbury, Saffron Walden, etc.), which furnished evidence of the growing participation in the town-study movement of University Schools of Geography, training colleges, and schools. After undergoing further enlargement the exhibition began at Edinburgh a tour of the principal cities of the kingdom.

Mention was made in last year's report of the room which had been temporarily provided for the use of Professor Geddes at

the University of London. In connection with the work done there during the winter of 1909-1910, representations were made by the Cities Committee to the University authorities with a view to the establishment of a Department of Civics in the University of London. The matter is now under consideration, and is forming the subject of correspondence between the Committee and the University.

---

### THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

President for the year.

The Council of the Sociological Society announces with great pleasure that the Right Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., has accepted the Presidentship of the Society for the year.

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

### MEETINGS DURING THE LENT TERM, 1911.

The first meeting of the Lent Term was held in the afternoon of February 7, when Sir Francis Younghusband read the paper on "LAMAISM IN TIBET," which appears in this number. Sir George Birdwood presided.

At an evening meeting on February 21, Dr. C. W. Saleeby delivered a lecture on "THE FOUNDATIONS OF EUGENICS," Mr. Swinny presiding. The paper will probably be published in the July number of the Review.

On March 7, at an afternoon meeting, Mr. Henry Wolff read a paper on "CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT," Mr. R. A. Yerburch, M.P., presiding. The paper appears in this number.

On April 4, at an evening meeting, Dr. D. S. Margoliouth read a paper on "THE UNIVERSAL RACES CONGRESS," Sir Edward Brabrook presiding. Beginning with a sketch of the Congress movement in East and West, the lecturer went on to discuss the significance of the term "race," its theoretical value and practical obscurity. The questions to be discussed at the Congress, being general human interests, arose out of the great cross-divisions of mankind. The purpose in each case was to foster the tendency to substitute co-operation for conflict. He enumerated six cross divisions, in order of indelibility—namely: the division (a) by sex, (b) by colour, (c) by nationality, (d) by language, (e) by religion, (f) by caste. Good results were to be expected from the Congress in bringing together men and women engaged in studying the problems of race, in directing public attention to schemes for improving inter-racial relations, and in organising future work directed to this end.

### THE ANNUAL MEETING.

The Annual General Meeting of the Society was held in the hall of the Royal Society of Arts on Tuesday, March 21, 1911, Mr. S. H. Swinny, Chairman of the Council, presiding.

The minutes of the last Annual Meeting were read and confirmed.

The Report of the Council for the year 1910 was read by the Secretary, and the motion that the Report and Statement of Accounts be accepted was moved from the Chair, seconded by Dr. Caldecott, and adopted *nem. con.*

The following members of Council offered themselves for re-election:—

Miss Mabel Atkinson.  
Mr. W. H. Beveridge.  
Dr. Bisschop.  
Rev. Dr. Caldecott.  
Miss Findlay.  
Professor Geddes.  
Mr. G. P. Gooch.  
Dr. A. C. Haddon.  
Mr. P. H. Hartog.  
Dr. A. J. Herbertson.  
Professor Hobhouse.  
Mr. J. A. Hobson.

Mr. George Montagu.  
Dr. F. W. Mott.  
Mr. H. O. Newland.  
Mr. J. Oliphant.  
Lieut.-Colonel Roberts.  
Dr. C. W. Saleeby.  
Mr. A. F. Shand.  
Mr. S. H. Swinny.  
Dr. J. Lionel Tayler.  
Professor E. J. Urwick.  
Professor Westermarck.  
Sir Francis Younghusband.

The Council made the following nominations for vacancies :—

Dr. W. Leslie Mackenzie.

Dr. Gilbert Slater.

Mr. Raymond Unwin.

Mr. A. E. Zimmern.

On the motion of Mr. Branford, seconded by Mr. W. Meakin, the foregoing were unanimously elected *en bloc*.

Mr. J. Martin White was re-elected Honorary Treasurer.

The resignation of the hon. secretaryship by Mr. V. V. Branford, announced in the Annual Report, was referred to by the Chairman and by Mr. Martin White, who both spoke of the great indebtedness of the Society to Mr. Branford for his invaluable services. Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe was thereupon elected Honorary Secretary.

At the conclusion of the formal business, Professor L. T. Hobhouse delivered, before a large audience, an address on "EUGENICS AND SOCIOLOGY." An animated discussion followed.